

(e) whether they propose to take over the control and supervision of such Muslim Wakf properties and institutions, and if so, what steps have been taken in this regard and what steps do they propose to take and when?

A.—Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—

(a) The Muslim Wakf Board of the former Hyderabad State, being a “body corporate” within the meaning of Section 109 of the States Reorganisation Act, 1956 continues to exercise jurisdiction over the three Districts of Gulbarga, Raichur and Bidar.

(b) The Muslim Wakf Board of Hyderabad can be divested of its jurisdiction over these Districts by the issue of a Notification by the Government of India under Section 4 of the Inter-State Corporation Act, 1957. The question is under correspondence with the Government of India.

(c), (d) & (e) Action can be taken by this Government only after the jurisdiction of the Muslim Wakf Board of Hyderabad over these three Districts is terminated.

2 P.M.

### Governor's Message to Motion of Thanks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have received a message from His Highness the Governor of Mysore which reads as follows :—

“23rd, March 1959.

To

The Members of the Legislative Assembly.

I have received with great satisfaction the expression of your thanks for the speech with which I opened the Budget Session, 1959, of both Houses of the Legislature.

JAYA CHAMARAJA WADIYAR,  
Governor of Mysore.”

### Leave of Absence

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—

I have received a letter from Sri T. R. Parameshwaraiah requesting leave of absence from the House from 3rd April till the end of the current session as he has been deputed by the Government of Mysore to attend the Orientation Training Course at the Central Institute of Study and Research on Community Development. Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to him to remain absent from all meetings of the House till the end of current session?

MEMBERS.—Yes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Permission is granted to the Hon'ble Member to remain absent.

### REPORT ON MYSORE ADMINISTRATION BY SRI A. D. GORWALA.

*Motion to consider (contd.)*

†ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣರಾವ್ (ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಿಟಿ).—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಾನು ಹಿಂದಿನ ದಿನ ಗೋವಾರ್ನರವರ ವರದಿಯ ಮೇರೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆ. ಅದರ ಕಾರಾವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಸಮಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಾಲ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ನಾನು ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟೇರಿಯಟ್ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆ. ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟೇರಿಯಟ್ನ ರೀ ಆರ್ಗನೈಸೇಷನ್ ಆಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವವರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನೂ ಒಬ್ಬ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೂಡ ಕೆಲವು ಸಲಹೆಗಳು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿವೆ. ಅದರ ಅವಕಾಶ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಡಳಿತ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟೇರಿಯಟ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರೀಕೃತವಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ decentralisation of functions ಆಗಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಎರಡನೆಯದು ಈಗ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟೇರಿಯಟ್ನಲ್ಲಿ top heavy administration ಇರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಅದಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಕಡಮೆಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಆಡಳಿತವನ್ನು ಏಕೀಕರಣ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಆಗ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಉಳಿಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾಗುವ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಯಾವ ದರ್ಜೆಯ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ವರ್ಗದವರಿಗೂ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗದ ಹಾಗೆ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಒಂದಲ್ಲ, ಒಂದು ವಿಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್

† Indicates that the remarks or speeches have not been revised by the member concerned,

(ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣರಾವ್)

ಸರ್ವಿಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿರುವವರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಮೋಷಣ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ತೊಂದರೆ ಬಹುದು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗದ ಹಾಗೆ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಪ್ರಮೋಷಣ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಹೇಗೆ ವರ್ತಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯಟ್ ರೀ ಆರ್ಗನೈಜೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನೂಪರಿಟೇಂಡೆಂಟ್ ಕೇಡರ್ ಇರಬಹುದು, ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಸಾಕು, ಸೆಕೆಂಡ್ ಡಿವಿಜನ್ ಕ್ಲರ್ಕ್ ಸಾಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಬಹುಶಃ ನೂಪರಿಟೇಂಡೆಂಟ್ ಕೇಡರ್ ಪ್ರೀನ್ಯಾಫೀಸ್ ಆಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದ್ದರೆ ಅಥವಾ ಆ ಕೇಡರಿನವರು ಪೇಷರುಗಳನ್ನು ಬಂಡಲು ಮಾಡಿ ಇಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೇನೂ ಕೆಲಸವಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಆ ಕೆಲಸಗಾರರನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ತರಬೇತುಮಾಡಿ ಅವರನ್ನೇ ಏಕೆ ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯಾಗಿ ಮತ್ತು ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯಾಗಿ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಾರದು? ಹೊರಗಡೆಯಿಂದ ಬಂದವರನ್ನು ಹೊರಗಡೆಗೇ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದರೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯೇನಿರುತ್ತದೆ ಅದರಂತೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೇ ಸಮಾನ ಜನವಿರುವುದು ಸಂಕೀರ್ಣವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬಾಕಿ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಹೇಗಿದೆಯೆಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಜನ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯರ ಸಂಪರ್ಕ ಎರಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಅರಿವಾಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅವರು ಹೊರಗೆ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ inter-departmental transfers outside the Secretariat ಆಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಅನೇಕ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಕಛೇರಿಗೆ ನೌಕರರು ಬರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋರ್ವಾಲಾರವರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹುಶಃ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಕ್ರಮಕೈಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಆಫೀಸಿಗೆ ಸಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದರೆ ಆಗ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯಟ್ ನೌಕರರಲ್ಲಾ ಬಂದೇ ಬರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ದಕ್ಷತೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಕೆಲವು ಸಲಹೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಎಷ್ಟುಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ self-contradictory ಎಂದು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಗೋರ್ವಾಲಾರವರು ದಕ್ಷತೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ನಾವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇವೆ ಇದ್ದೇವೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಪ್ರಮೋಷನ್ ಕೇಡರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡ ರಿಸರ್ವೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದರೆ ದಕ್ಷತೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ? ಬಹಳ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹುದ್ದೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಮೋಷನ್ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ, ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವಾಗ ಯಾವ ರಿಸರ್ವೇಷನ್ ಹಾಕಿ ಯಾರನ್ನು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ, ಯಾವ ಕ್ಯಾಪಾಸಿಟಿಯ ಜನರನ್ನು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದಮೇಲೆ ಕೆಲವು ವೃತ್ತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸೆರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಅವರ ಒಂದು ದಕ್ಷತೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಗಮನಿಸಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಬಾಕಿ ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣ ದಿಂದಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಯಾವ ಹೊರಗಿನ ಒಂದು ಕಛೇರಿಯ ರೇಷನ್ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಕಾರಣವಾಗಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಪ್ರಮೋಷನ್ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು. ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಎಫಿಷಿಯೆನ್ಸಿ ಕೇಳಿ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಡೆ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಎಫಿಷಿಯೆನ್ಸಿ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಾನ್ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಸೆಪರೇಟ್ ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬ್ಯಾಲೆನ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸಹಜ.

ಅದು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಈಗಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯ ನಡೆದರೂ ಚಿಂತೆಯಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದರೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಅದಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಅಡ್ಡಸ್ಸು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕ ಎಂಬುದು ನನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಕೆಲವು ನಿರ್ಬಂಧಗಳಿದ್ದರೆ that can be made up in recruitment policy. ಬ್ಯಾಕ್‌ವರ್ಡ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಬಹುಶಃ ಸರಿ ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಪುನರ್ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವೆಂದು ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋರ್ವಾಲಾರವರೇ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಅದಷ್ಟು ಬೇಗ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂಬುದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋರ್ವಾಲಾರವರು ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸುವಾಗ ನನ್ನ ಭಾವನೆ ಇಷ್ಟಿದೆ. ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋರ್ವಾಲಾರವರು ಒಂದು ಪರ್ವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಯಮಿತರಾದರು. ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ಸ್ ಇಂಟೆಗ್ರೇಷನ್ ಆದಮೇಲೆ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಿರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬ ಪೂರ್ಣ ಚಿತ್ರ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದಾಗ ಅವರು ನಿಯಮಿತರಾಗಿ ವರದಿಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬಹುಶಃ ಅವರು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿದ್ದರೆ ಈಗ ಮಾಡಿರುವಷ್ಟು ಅಬ್ಸರ್ವೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದು ನನ್ನ ಭಾವನೆ. ಅವರು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಎರಡನೆಯ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆ ಮುಗಿಯುವುದರೊಳಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ದಿವಾಳಿ—ಆ ಪದ ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ—ತಾಪತ್ರಯ ಪಡಬೇಕಾದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬರಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋರ್ವಾಲಾರವರು ಒಂದು ಶಂಕೆ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದು ಸುಳ್ಳು, ತಪ್ಪು ಎಂದು ತೋರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋರ್ವಾಲಾರವರು ಒಂದು ಶಂಕೆಯನ್ನು ಎರಡನೆಯ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿರುವುದು ಸುಳ್ಳು ಎಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಕಾರಣ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಈ ವರ್ಷ ನಮ್ಮ ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ ಕೂಡ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಆಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣ ಸೆಂಟ್ರಲ್ ಗ್ಯಾಂಟ್ಸ್ ಬಂದಿರಬಹುದು, ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೆಲವು ಸಹಾಯ ಒದಗಿರಬಹುದು. ಇದನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಿ ಅವರು ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಧಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಪುನರ್ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಇರುವ ತೊಂದರೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಗಮನಿಸಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಅವರು ಯೋಚಿಸಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ನಿಜವಾದ ಅರಿವು ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ಅಥವಾ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸಹಾನುಭೂತಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡುತ್ತದೆಯೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಪ್ರಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಗಮನಿಸಿ ಬಹುಶಃ ಮೂರನೆಯ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ಪುನರ್ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸಹಜ. ಈ ದಿವಸದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಈ ದಿವಸವೇ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ದಿವಸದ ರೂಪರೇಖೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಕೆಲಸ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋರ್ವಾಲಾರ ಶಂಕೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ, ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅನುಸರಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವ ಮಾರ್ಗವನ್ನು ಮುಂದು



ವರಿಸಿದರೆ ಬಹುಶಃ ಇನ್ನೆರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಿಧಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೂ ತೊಂದರೆ ಪಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಮೂರನೆಯ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಯ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯೋಜನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆಗ್ಗೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋರ್ವಾಲಾರವರು ಮಾದಿರತಕ್ಕಂತೆ forecast ಅಥವಾ prophesy ನುಳ್ಳು ಆಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋರ್ವಾಲಾರವರು ಪ್ರೊಹಿಬಿಷನ್ ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಇನ್ನು ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಮಾತು. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಉದ್ದಿಮೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಕಿದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಾಪಸ್ ಪಡೆಯಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಅವರು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇದು ತತ್ವಶಃ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹಣ ಹಾಕುವಾಗ ಬಡ್ತಿ ಪಡೆಯಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹಾಕಿದ ಹಣ ಪೋಲು ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ದೇಶದ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ಸ್ ತೀಟು ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟು ಕೊಂಡು ನಾವು ಹಾಕಿದ ಹಣದ ಮೇಲೆ ಡಿವಿಡೆಂಡ್ ಬರೆಯುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಇದರಿಂದ ನಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಭಾವನೆ ಸರಿಯಾದುದಿಲ್ಲ. ದೇಶದ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಿಸಿದಷ್ಟು ಡಿವಿಡೆಂಡ್ ಬಾರದೆ ಕೋಗಬಹುದು. ಇವೆಲ್ಲ ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳು ಉಪಯುಕ್ತವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಹಣ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಸತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋರ್ವಾಲಾರವರು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇನ್‌ಕಂಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ತಪ್ಪಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಇನ್‌ಕಂಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಾದರೂ ಸಹ ಅದರ ರಿಟರ್ನ್ ನಮಗೆ ಬಂದೇ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಯಾಕೆಂದರೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಸಹಾಯ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. "Autonomous board of experienced non-officials set up by the statute would be a solution" ಎಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಬೇಗ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಇದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋರ್ವಾಲಾರವರು ಚಾಕ್ಸ್ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಒಳ್ಳೆ ಸಲಹೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರ ಸಲಹೆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತೀವ್ರ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. Tax departments, revenue yielding departments, commercial taxes ಇವೆಲ್ಲ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಒಟ್ಟು ಮಂತ್ರಿಯ ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಭಾವನೆ. Village officers ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. District registrars ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಅನವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿದೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಮಾತು ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. "Non-gazetted appointments outside, to be filled

up by the Divisional Commissioners, who are representatives of the Public Service Commission, to serve the needs of the Division so far as third and fourth class of employments are concerned," ಬಹುಶಃ ಅದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಭಾವನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸದ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ಅವರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನಡೆಸತಕ್ಕಂಥ ನ್ಯೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಖಾಸಗಿಯವರು ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದರೆ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಎಂದು ಸಲಹೆಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬಹುಶಃ ಇದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ನನಗೆ ಅನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಉತ್ತೇಜನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಒಳ್ಳೆ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಸಲಹೆ ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾರ್ಚಿ ತಿಂಗಳ ಕಡೆಯ ವಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಡೆಯ ದಿನ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಆಗಬಾರದು. ಮಾರ್ಚಿ ತಿಂಗಳಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಅದನ್ನು ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿಯೇ ಕೊಡುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಮೊದಲೇ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ತೀವ್ರ ಗಮನಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ರಿಪೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಅನೇಕ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಈ ಧೋರಣೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗಿದೆ. ಕಡೆಯ ತಿಂಗಳಿನ ಕಡೆಯ ವಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಹಣ ಕೊಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಸಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ದೊರೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಚೆಕ್ ಕಳಿಸಿದರೂ ಅದು ತಲಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಹಣ lapse ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗಾಗುವುದರಿಂದ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಕಡೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷ ಜನವರಿ ತಿಂಗಳಿನಲ್ಲಿಯಾದರೂ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಂದು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಎರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಗ್ರಾಮಾಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಚಾಪ್ಟರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋರ್ವಾಲಾರವರು ಬಹಳ ಕಟುವಾಗಿ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಅಪ್ಪರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಸಮಾಜ ವಿಕಾಸ ಮತ್ತು ವಿಸ್ತರಣಾ ಯೋಜನೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ನ್ಯೂನಾತಿರಕ್ತಗಳು ಇವೆ. ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹಣ ನಷ್ಟವಾಗಿರಬಹುದು, ವ್ಯರ್ಥವಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಆಗಿರಬಹುದು. ಹೀಗೆಂದವಾತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಏನೇನೂ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಷ್ಟು pessimistic view ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯ ಪ್ರಾಪ್ತಿಯಾದ ನಂತರ, ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಯಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಶ್ರೀ ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಗೋರ್ವಾಲಾರವರು ವಿಮರ್ಶಮಾಡಿದ್ದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. Planning Commission ನವರು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ಎಲ್ಲ ಯೋಜನೆಗಳು paper schemes ಆಗಿವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. Co-operative

(ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣರಾವ್)  
movement, rural development, small irrigation works ಮುಂತಾದ ಯೋಜನೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರಕಾರ ತೀವ್ರ ಗಮನ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಅನೇಕ ಸಣ್ಣ ಪುಟ್ಟ ಗ್ರಾಮಾಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರಕಾರದವರು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ಹಣದ ಸಹಾಯದಿಂದ ಈ ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥಿತವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಇವೊತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಒಂದು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮನ್ನು ಕೈಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಿರಬಹುದು. ಇವತ್ತು ದೇಶಾದ್ಯಂತವಾಗಿ ಈ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಯಾವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ನಡೆದೇ ಇರಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಅತ್ಯಲ್ಪವಾದ ಪ್ರಗತಿ ಎಂದು ಯೋಜನೆಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಫಿಸಿಕಲ್ ಟಾರ್ಜೆಟ್ ಎಷ್ಟಾಗಬೇಕೋ ಅಷ್ಟಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಗೋರ್ವಾಲಾ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಮನೋಭಾವ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯ ಮಾತ್ರ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಮಾಡಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಗೋರ್ವಾಲಾ ಅವರ frame of the mind ಎಷ್ಟು ಅಗಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಅವರ frame of mind ಏನೇ ಇರಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಸೂಚನೆಮಾಡಿ, ಒಂದು ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಕೂಡಿ ಎಂದ ಮೇಲೆ, ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಭಾಗಗಳಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವರನ್ನು ದೂಷಿಸುವುದು ಸುಹೇಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. Really creditable ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅವನ್ನು ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ನಾವೇ ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ರಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ಆ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಷ್ಟಾಗಿ ಲಘುವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಷ್ಟು ಮಾದರೇಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. We will have to be charitable to him and take whatever that is constructive in his Report. ಹಂಸಕ್ರೇರ ನ್ಯಾಯದಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ದೇಶಕ್ಕೇ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂಥಾದ್ದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಏನು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ? ಆ ಭಾಗಗಳನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಯಾವ ಸುಹೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ತಪ್ಪಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋರ್ವಾಲಾವರ ವರದಿಯಿಂದ ಬಹಳಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಉಪಕಾರವಾಗಿದೆ, ಅದು ಉಪಯುಕ್ತವಾಗಿದೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೋ ಅಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಕಾರ್ಯಗತಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am afraid I will have to strike a rather different note from the speech now made by my distinguished friend the Hon'ble Member Sri Sooryanarayana Rao.

Sir, I cannot appreciate the wisdom or even the propriety of the Government of Mysore in having appointed this one-man committee for looking into the administration of the State. Well Sir, it is not clear from the report whether the Government of Mysore fixed any terms of reference to this one-man committee and whether these findings of this one-man committee are based on these terms of reference. It seems to me that the Government of Mysore gave to this officer a blank cheque.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—The terms of reference are mentioned in the Government order.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—We do not know that. The Government have not published the Government order in publishing this Report.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—It is in the Government order.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am glad that the Government have not attached to this Report a copy of the Government Order indicating the terms of reference and by the way this has gone.....

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Ramanagaram).—Will the Government be pleased to read the terms of reference? It is better that it is read.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—The terms of reference are :

1. To examine the administrative structure of the different Departments of Government and to make recommendations for establishing uniformity and efficiency in administrative structure throughout the State with a view to increase efficiency and enforce all possible economies in Governmental expenditure.
2. To review the existing sources of revenue and the adequacy of steps taken to administer the taxation laws with a view to secure the maximum of revenue legitimately due and reduce losses on account of administrative latches.

3. To review the arrangements for the administration of the State-owned industries and suggest a pattern of administration for the efficient management and further development.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am grateful to the Hon'ble the Chief Minister for reading these terms of reference. Sir, it is very usual that when official reports are published and placed in the hands of the public, to also print along with them a copy of the original Government order along with the terms of reference and the report makes specific reference to the terms of reference. That is not done in this case. Otherwise that comment would not have emanated from me.

Sir, I want to know what were the circumstances that prevailed with the Government of Mysore to approach a rank outsider, however eminent he might be, whatever his attainment and whatever be his capacities, to examine the administrative aspects and draw up a report. I should like to know also what were the special circumstances in selecting this particular individual to do that work of going into the administrative details. Sir, there was no need for any such enquiry in regard to the several aspects of the administration. There was no aspect of administration which needed such a scrutiny which required probing into and I should like to know what were the special circumstances which prompted the Government to appoint this particular outsider.

Another thing is, when the Government decided to appoint Sri Gorwala to look into the details of the administration and suggest certain remedies in regard to the points mentioned in the terms of reference, it should not be forgotten that the reorganisation of the New State had not been completed. He makes reference in his report to what the state of administration was in the month of November 1957. In fact there were enormous disorders and dislocations of work. The whole thing was in a state of flux. Government have made an admission on the floor of this House that hundreds

of bundles of files relating to the integrating areas had not been opened and files had not been distributed to the several sections. When the whole of the administrative machinery was being geared up to greater, higher and increasing responsibilities, Government should have considered whether, at such a juncture and when matters are in such a state of confusion a clear picture of the standard of administration would ever emerge. It seems to me that it was most inopportune for the Government to ask such a person to make an examination and make a report on the state of administration at this stage. I consider that this particular action of Government was purely a question of lack of prudence. If I want to be a little more generous, I may say, it is a sorry state of affairs arising out of an error of judgment on the part of the Government in appointing this gentleman.

Even in the year of grace, 1959, I hear that there are some areas of the world where a system of licensed mourners—professional mourners—is prevailing. The idea is, they pay money for mourning, the actual amount depending upon the dignity and the status of the individual. They hire mourners by hundreds. Sir, by the appointment of my friend Sri Gorwala, this Government of Mysore seems to have instituted a system of licensed abusers. In this case, the individual is not paid. That is the only difference. Sir, in one word, I can only say this. He has shown himself to be an adept in the art of invectives! if I may use that word. He has specialised in levelling abuses from top to bottom—Ministers are not spared, Secretaries to Government are not spared, Officers at the district level are not spared, the Divisional Commissioners are not spared, the Under Secretaries, the Superintendents, the First Division and Second Division clerks and even attenders and peons. Possibly all conceivable human beings connected with the Mysore administration, have come in for some sort of abuse or other by this gentleman. Even Legislators are not spared. I think they have a smaller share. Sir, many suggestions

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

have been made by him and his views expressed in an unrestrained, and intemperate language bordering on vulgarity of the most ordinary type. That makes these views that are expressed in that language as being divorced from reason. I will later refer to certain portions of the Report in order to substantiate the statement that I am making. Sir, sometimes reading this Report, one is bound to be left with the impression that it may be the sort of political oratory of the thoroughfare type to which one is accustomed too often to hear. These observations avoid scrupulously details of the problems involved.

2-30 P.M.

I am coming to that fact to show how he has evaded the issues, the fundamental and major issues. He has evaded some problems. Further he has simply ignored many of the fundamental aspects. Sir, such an oratory may appeal to the man in the street, but I may assure you on behalf of this House which consists of a large majority and for that matter cent per cent people predominantly discriminating in their views, it is not likely to carry any appeal to them by this kind of oratory. Well, Sir, I have seen and I have marked certain passages where I am convinced that a vast gulf divides appreciation of reality from emotionalism. The whole thing is characterised by emotionalism. It was said of Edmund Burke, if I remember correctly that "he was right but he was considered to be right too soon." I have to say this and compare my esteemed friend Sri Gorwala with the great Edmund Burke, and say whatever he has said about the administration of the State of Mysore, he has been right and right too soon. He has shown a mortal hurry to suggest drastic changes without considering the previous history and causes that led to the existing order of things. He has not taken sufficient data into consideration before venturing to make his suggestions for the future. Well, Sir, after all, coming to his proposals, what are his proposals? I

want to classify them into two categories:- One, sane criticisms and the other insane criticisms. So far as sane criticism is concerned, I shall come to it later. So far as insane criticism is concerned, he is responsible for it himself and I will not criticise him for that at all. So far as sane criticism is concerned, I am asking the Government why they have, in this one particular case, with a supreme sense of duty and promptitude which has surprised many people in this House and outside and at any rate it has staggered me, given a complete list of proposals accepted, proposals implemented, proposals proposed to be implemented, proposals not accepted and proposals under consideration, etc. I am asking if this is the kind of treatment you have given to all official reports placed before the Government in the past. Further what are his proposals? If you will kindly take the trouble of going through the official reports of the proceedings of this Hon'ble House for the past three sessions, you will find that there is not a single worthwhile criticism or suggestion made by my friend Sri Gorwala which has escaped the critical eye of the legislators or failed to receive the earnest attention of the Members of this House on that side as well as on this side. I must say that a contribution has been made, the largest contribution has been made by the members by referring to matters of public importance in almost every Department of Government. I have gone through the list, scrutinised it ten times. But I do not find one single point which has not been referred to by the legislators in this House. Well, Sir, without being conceited, I myself have made a contribution to the largest number of points by way of criticism and I think I have been singled out as the worst critic of Government but the point is what is the treatment that you have given to us, I am asking on behalf of the entire House? Is it because we did not indulge in the type of abuse that my friend Gorwala indulged in that you did not care for us? In fact, when you replied to the debate which had been carried on for a number of days, two days, three days or even four days, you have

SRI A. D. GORWALA

burked major issues, you have simply said that all those points you will would look into. My point is this: while talking of finance, some of us have raised fundamental issues that at the end of 1960 when the debt position of Mysore State is going to be a little difficult, how are you going to manage it? Are your irrigational projects going to yield the necessary returns for the repayment of your instalments of loans and the corpus of the loan itself? Are your industries going to pay? Are your irrigation projects going to do it? If neither of these things is going to meet the demand for repayment of the loans, what do you propose to do? We have asked for rationalisation of loans; we have asked for a period of 30 to 40 years, for repayment; in a number of cases you have burked the issues; you have not cared to reply. But here is the case of Mr. Gorwala's Report where you have tabulated the entire 90 points and stated what you propose to do with them. I am afraid while you have shown us scant courtesy you have shown all respect to a rank outsider who came here as a visitor.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Minister for Finance).—This is very uncharitable. In fact we have given the utmost consideration to the suggestions made. There was a Report and certain suggestions made therein have been accepted.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I will give you a long list of major issues in respect of which the Government have not given proper replies and which have not even been referred to in the course of the debates because of lack of time. My point is, out of 100 points that the members of this House have made, you might have given effect to 10 or 20 per cent; but here out of 90 points made by Mr. Gorwala, you have got something to say about everything. That is the point. If you will kindly catalogue the criticism, constructive criticism and the the helpful suggestions made by the Members of this House, particularly by the Members of the Opposition, they will pile up to a formidable number and it will be ten times or twelve times the wonderful

production of Mr. Gorwala. Well, Sir, I will only say this. You have merely displayed a sense of lack of proportion in trying to glorify the Report of Mr. Gorwala.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Who said so? We never glorified. I will tell you later. You are very uncharitable.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—There are local papers which gave continuous publication to the report in 20 columns and 30 columns and for the whole week the Report was published. I make an appeal to the same papers to publish the criticism of Gorwala Report in the same way as they published that Report. The point is this: It is fair criticism. I said there are many portions of Mr. Gorwala's Report which are same criticism.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—The press people are very fair and they will give the same publicity to criticisms also.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I have got the greatest faith in my friends of the Press. They have always been my life long friends and I am not saying a word against them. Even if they do the worst, I will not think ill of them at all. Of Mr. Gorwala, you may say that it has been a labour of love and that he was not paid and that it did not cost the State Exchequer much except by way of printing the Report. But is that a valid ground to indulge in this kind of gratuitous piece of abuse over the entire field of administration commencing from the Ministers downwards? I want to ask another thing.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Kindly don't put into our mouth what we have not said so far.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am only saying whatever appears on the surface in this Report, and whatever is mentioned in this Report. My point is this: in trying to glorify this Report .....

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—We did not want this Report to be discussed at all. It is at your instance we have placed this Report before you. We did not want to glorify it at all. Don't put it to us.

**Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.**—You have glorified it in this manner. Now that you have been able to tell me about this, I would have brushed aside this and brought a vote of censure against him on the floor of this House. The first opening sentence of the Report runs thus:

“Governmental and administrative efficiency is, as you know, even more a matter of morale than of technique, and the morale of an administration cannot be sustained if a dark cloud of suspicion is allowed to continue to overhang it. For morale to improve, the cloud must be dissipated.”

Then he accuses the Members of the Legislative Assembly as not being alive to their responsibilities and not having raised a discussion or debate on the floor of this House. Is he to come and teach us what our duties are? On that very ground I would have moved a vote of censure against that gentleman. You say you have not glorified the Report. In spite of the fact that he has made reckless allegation of a serious nature against the Ministry, have you recorded your protest at any stage in any manner? The worst critics of your Government are the Opposition people; they have made always constructive criticisms; at no stage—I am speaking on behalf of the entire 58 Opposition Members—have we allowed any criticism to be made out of malice; we do not want to sacrifice the prestige of the State when we criticise you or the officers of the Government. After all, today you may be there; tomorrow we may be there; but we have not done anything to damage the reputation of the State.

**Sri T. MARIAPPA.**—But don't say that we have glorified the Report.

**Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Gubbi).**—Why did you release the Report to the Press if it is not for glorification?

**Sri T. MARIAPPA.**—After all it is a report to which we are a party and we have to release it.

**Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.**—Why did you say that we pressed for the discussion on the floor of this House?

**Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.**—He has said in this Report a few things about some people—some officers and non-officials whom he has taken as partners. He has used the word partners who have with their experience guided him and advised him. I should like to know who are all the officers who interviewed him and who are all the non-officials who actually advised him and who were all those people who endeared themselves to him, who were very affectionate to him and gave all these interesting details and advised him. I want to know what are the official records that were placed before him. What were the statistics that were furnished to him?

**Sri T. MARIAPPA.**—Let the Hon'ble Member draw his own conclusions. Only he should not think that we have glorified Sri Gorwala. You can shower all the abuses. . . .

**Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.**—Your intention might have been otherwise. But in the ultimate analysis the result is that you have glorified the gentleman. I am not jealous of him. I am sorry not for you all.

**Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).**—When we on the Opposition side made several criticisms you have given effect to them.

**Sri T. MARIAPPA.**—You are uncharitable. Whenever criticisms were made they have been given effect to. There is the Committee on Assurances.

**Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.**—If I am given three days leave I am prepared to give you a long list of the suggestions we have made on major issues.

Another thing. The Report hardly possesses in substance the impress of an official document, when you see the language used in certain places. There are one or two sentences. With regard to Ministers he says ‘whose father's divali is it?’ It is attacking the Ministers. I would not have tolerated if I had been a Minister which I will never be perhaps *Laughter*). He next refers to dogs barking. He says that a Minister who does not really appreciate the value of decentralisation of functions, distributes his power and share, his



SRI A. D. GORWALA

power with the Secretaries at every stage is like a dog being kept and himself barking. Such is the type of reference in an official document. Do you think it is a dignified document?

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIA.—The exact words appear on page 18:

‘The classical saying on this subject is: “Do not keep a dog and bark yourself”.’

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Will you please read it in the context of the reference that he has made to the Secretaries and Ministers? Is it fair, I ask. Is there a parallel to this for an undignified language used in an official document? This kind of criticism is abundantly proved by the evidence on record that we are being most inexperienced administrators. He professes to be an experienced administrator. But he has been neither civil nor has he done any service worth mentioning. This is the type of I.C.S. man whom you have appointed. One other thing is that he has got the attitude of bossing, and glossing over many material points which require a little more detailed examination. These are the words I am using—glossing and bossing. These are the two net effects of his Report and you are glorifying him.

One other thing about which I am sorry to say is this. Having been trained in a particular atmosphere he seems to have no faith at all in democracy. It is tragic that in the Year of Grace 1959 nobody excluding me or including me can still have any wavering faith in democracy.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It is often said that Civil Servants wonderfully adjust themselves to the new set-up.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am grateful to him for the veiled compliment. The point is this. If even now there are pitfalls or difficulties or drawbacks, I do not think anybody can have any lack of faith in democracy.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—When the country has accepted.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—That is the future pattern of development of this world. So far as the Ministers are concerned, Sri Gorwala has no respect. He has made it very clear—dogs and

barking (*Lau hter*). So far as Secretaries are concerned he says that they are a set of incompetent people who lack initiative, who lack drive, who lack a realistic approach, application and who are incapable of taking any decision. On page 46 he says:

“The habit of wanting to see all or almost all files into which some Ministers and Secretaries fall, obsessed by their belief in their own capacity, cannot but be deplored. Such men need not be Secretaries and Deputy Secretaries, capable of applying their minds to and deciding cases, but mere amanuenses standing around to note with awe whatever falls from the master’s lips.”

Does he mean that they write to the dictation at somebody’s bidding? Of course under the revised system recommended by Sri Gorwala there are some Under Secretaries who copy down what the assistants have been doing. There are experienced assistants and Superintendents who do noting and the Under Secretaries sign. I shall come to that later.

What about legislators? He says that there are some legislators who do not hesitate to stoop to beg for an invitation. Is that the way in which he refers to accredited representatives of the people? Do you think any one of us is in that unhappy position of going and begging for an invitation? I will not do it even if God Almighty comes. When God Almighty comes ಎಂದೇಕೋರು ತ್ರೇವೆ. Can he make that allegation in an official report? He next refers to the Prime Minister and the Governor. He says that the Governor has been given sumptuary allowance and when the Prime Minister comes to Bangalore or Mysore, it is the concern of the Governor to entertain him. Do you think that the Prime Minister comes here for being treated sumptuously or handsomely? Is this the way in which he should refer to the head of the State who is the Prime Minister of the country? Is this the type of report that should be encouraged or which should not be criticised or which should be applauded?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Whoever said so?

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palaiyam).—The very fact that you are implementing some of the recommendations shows that you have respected it.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Many of the recommendations, as the Hon'ble Member himself said, are suggestions which have been made in season and out of season and they are already invogue. Because he mentions them in his report it does not mean they are new.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In this context of wholesale indictment of the Mysore administration I should like to refer to what distinguished people in the past have said about Mysore. When there were British provinces administered by the pick of Indian Civil Servants, when the Mysore State did not possess a single Indian Civil Servant. Mysore was held out as a pattern for efficient administration. Is it the suggestion of my friend Sri Gorwala that everything has gone wrong because he came and looked into a few defects? This is the type of an uncharitable remark which he was hardly justified in making.

Talking of the Secretariat without any sense of self-importance, I may say that I have worked from the position of an ordinary Assistant Secretary, Under Secretary—then he was of Senior Assistant Commissioner's status—I have been an Additional Secretary and a full-fledged Secretary and I have had the benefit of looking into the administration of every branch in connection with the re-organisation of the Secretariat during the Dewan-ship of my esteemed senior Sri N. Madhava Rao. I have acquainted myself with the details of the working of the Secretariat in its several branches. I will relate one particular instance on this occasion, lest I forget: There was a file in which one particular Second Division clerk expressed his view in regard to a particular matter. The Superintendent of the Section for some reason on another suggested that this offended against the existing Secretariat manual, where the clerk or the case-worker concerned is prevented from

expressing an opinion on any point. He suggested to the Under Secretary that this Clerk might be warned. The matter came up and in course of time the file was submitted to the Dewan for passing final orders on the subject, matter of the file. With the most critical eye, characteristic of Sir Ramaswamy Mudaliar, he marked that particular portion in red pencil and said "I am grateful to the young man who has given a very clear and convincing picture of the whole case. His opinion will be my order. Orders will issue accordingly". I am quoting this particular instance to show that talents, intelligence, integrity and devotion to work are not the monopoly of individuals, be they I.A.S. or I.C.S. or even Ministers. I know of people who were my classmates who got 89 per cent, whereas I got 62 per cent. They are...

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Please do not include Ministers. We do not clamour for monopolies.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I have not been understood correctly. I know that the Hon'ble the Finance Minister is one of the brilliant men. I am not a flatterer; I am only giving him his due. I am telling this without a sense of discrimination. I know my friend Sri Kadidal Manjappa for a number of years and I know what type of man he is. Without going into individual merits...

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—He is pulling us!

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I was telling that some of my friends who secured 89 per cent as against the 26 per cent I secured, have not been able to draw even a hundred rupees per month. Some of them, with the greatest difficulty, have been able to keep body and soul together. Somehow luck favoured me differently. I would not go into it. What I am saying is: do not belittle the importance of the smaller people in the Secretariat.

I will now deal with such of the points which are of a specific nature. On the 8th October 1958, the new system of office procedure was intended to be introduced in the G.A.D. of the Secretariat. The Government Order issued in this connection makes it

SRI A. D. GORWALA

abundantly clear that the extension of the revised system will be given effect to after reviewing the results of the working of this system. I want to ask whether after the three months were over, any review has been made by any agency and what were the results of that review? Has it been found to be an unqualified success? Has it secured efficiency, and quick despatch of work? Has it been conducive to harmonious working of the Secretariat? Have the Government scrutinised the effects of the working of this system by these three acid tests of efficiency? If that review had revealed cent per cent success, there would have been justification for extending it. I understand that for the last 1½ months the system has been introduced in the Revenue Secretariat. I want to know whether the Government have decided to expand the new system on a phased programme. I know that all claims are being made in regard to this particular system that it is going to secure 100 per cent efficiency.

Mr. Gorwala has criticised one particular aspect of the administration. He says that files have a tendency of getting lost. My experience of the Secretariat shows that a letter, whether it be a post-card or a cover or a representation or a memorandum or an address or official communication, when it comes to the Secretariat, it would be registered and a complete history of the case would be recorded, till the matter is finally disposed of or a Government Order is issued and communicated to the several officers concerned. I do not know when this particular system of filing, the so-called movement registers and the like were introduced and when the old system was discontinued. I understand that a system called the "P.V.R. system" was introduced in the Secretariat lately by which when a file goes to the Deputy Secretary, its further progress cannot be traced. I am making a statement of fact. This is what prompted Mr. Gorwala to say that files have a tendency of getting lost, and that this must be put an end to. It did not require the genius of Mr. Gorwala to commend the

introduction of file registers, when this system was already in vogue. This once again goes to prove that the man has not gone into the details. Was this change-over done with the authority and concurrence of the Government and the Cabinet? Who authorised the Chief Secretary to introduce the new system?

On page 41, Mr. Gorwala says that "when however a file goes beyond the Under Secretary, the file register loses touch with it." For example if you want to find out where the file is, what has happened to it, I am told that it takes two to three days or even eight days. But under the old system, even the intermediate references were being registered, written down. Supposing for any reason a file was lost, there have been occasions when I have built up records from the existing file registers. Supposing a file was with a Minister for a considerable time, the Minister would be told that he is a defaulter to the extent of so many days. Everything was noted in the register. We had a Reminder Clerk who used to remind once a week or a fortnight. I want the Minister concerned to make a note of this and tell me as to who changed this procedure. Did the Cabinet authorise it? If that system had not been changed, this paragraph in page 41 would not have found a place, in the Gorwala Report. To say the least, it was rather high-handed on the part of the Chief Secretary to have changed the system without sufficient authority and if the Cabinet had authorised it, I am afraid it has not done so wisely and there is no justification to change it.

Under the new experiment being made in some of the Secretariat departments, one Under Secretary is expected to dispose of 35 to 40 files a day. Under the Reorganisation scheme, Government have increased the number of Under Secretaries increased the number of stenographers decreased the number of first division clerks and increased one or two second division clerks. I do not wish to go into the details. This order creates three new Under Secretaries. Where there were three Under Secretaries,

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

six are needed now; where there were six Superintendents, they are all to be dismissed; where there were 24 first division clerks, they are to be reduced to 18. The number of second division clerks is to be increased. As against this reduction in the number of non-gazetted posts, Government wants to increase the number of Under Secretaries on salary of 300-700. This is the type of socialist pattern of society that functions at the Secretariat level. I would like to look impartially whether this scheme suggested by Mr. Gorwala will promote efficiency.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—No one would be retrenched.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—This is the very camouflage that has been placed over the eyes of the Ministers. I am prepared to prove to the hilt that this system would result in no saving but would on the other hand involve an additional expenditure of 10 lakhs of rupees, if the scheme is introduced throughout the Secretariat. The bogey of savings is a myth. It is only in the imagination of the gentleman who put forward this proposal.

*The House adjourned for Lunch at Three of the Clock and re-assembled at Thirty Minutes past Three of the Clock.*

[DR. R. NAGAN GOWDA in the Chair].

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, before the House rose for recess I was talking about the Secretariat system. In this connection I should like to invite the attention of this House to the antiquity of the present system which has undergone a few changes here and there, but the substance of the old system that subsists owes its origin to the days of 1919 when one distinguished Civilian D. M. Narasing Rao was deputed by the Government of Mysore to study the system of Secretariat procedure both in the Central Secretariat and the several Provincial

Secretariats. I have had the privilege of working with the late A.R. Bannerji who was the Dewan for some time and Todhunter who was the Governor of Madras for a day and who was Private Secretary to late Sri Krishnaraja Wodeyar, and Pula Reddy, another I.C.S. man, who was Revenue Minister of Mysore. These were all Indian Civil Service men who had praised this system which was prevalent till very recently and which is even now prevalent in most of the Sections. Before any radical change was contemplated, the man concerned should have gone into the genesis of the whole affair and introduced this change. There was nothing radically wrong with this system. After 1923 this system was introduced even in the districts. It was an extension of the scheme of Secretariat procedure to the districts so as to secure quick despatch of work. In 1923 I happened to be in Hassan District and I had the occasion to study the working of this system in the several districts and so I say that before even one item of the old procedure was interfered with sufficient consideration should have been given to the details of the scheme from the time it was inaugurated. It seems to me from the recommendations of my friend Sri Gorwala that he has pitched upon one particular point about the loss of files which is entirely due to what I called the P.V.R. system which has been unauthorisedly introduced in the Secretariat.

Now I come to the regular scheme which is published in the Official Gazette. This scheme tends to increase the number of Under Secretaries. I have a list showing that instead of this scheme resulting in saving there will be increase in expenditure. Saving is no consideration so far as I am concerned, but since the bogey of saving is put forward by the authors of this Scheme I wish to point out that there would be no savings at all. There are 84 Branches in the Secretariat. From the latest figures available, the average receipt in each Branch is of the order of 45 to 50. If you take into consideration the total receipts, according to the quota fixed for disposal of files for

each Under Secretary, we would require as many as 153 Under Secretaries if the scheme is extended to the whole Secretariat as against existing 46. By a very detailed calculation which has been checked by mathematical experts, it will increase the cost by Rs. 90,256 per month amounting to a total of over Rs. 10 lakhs per annum, and yet it is claimed that this scheme will result in saving. So far as saving is concerned, that aspect of the whole theory is exploded. I am quite prepared to discuss it with anybody who is prepared to look at it very reasonably.

The present Under Secretaries in the reorganised scheme are expected to dispose of 40 files each a day. I wish the authors of this enthusiastic plan had made a distinction between disposal of cases and disposal of files. The disposal of a file means only that you make some observation and chuck it off from your table to another table, but the disposal of a case is totally different. Previously every case worker had to deal with 7 files a day. Now we are eliminating the case workers under the new scheme and noting has got to be done by the Under Secretary himself. Can you reasonably expect, having regard to the time allotted for a working day, an Under Secretary to look into the details of 40 files and making the noting himself? I understand that 2 stenographers are sanctioned for each Under Secretary under the new scheme. Dictating a note is an art which requires training and development of the faculty. It does not come naturally. There was a time when the system of dictating judgments was introduced in law courts. I happened to be in the K.G.F. Magistrate's court when this system was introduced and it took some time for all of us before we could get into the hang of dictating. Is it possible for an Under Secretary to study the details of 40 files and make the noting on them in his own hand? It is not possible. Under the old system, as soon as a case came to the case worker, he had to study it and make the noting; then it would go to the Superintendent who would have put in 15 to 20 years, to express his opinion. It would then go to the Assistant

Secretary for the opinion of a gazetted officer. Then it would go to the Deputy Secretary and from him to the Additional Secretary or Secretary. The whole idea is that at different stages, like the three readings of a Bill before the Legislature, it would get criticised and it would be looked at from various angles before it is finally placed before the Minister for final orders. At that stage the Minister would have before him all aspects of the case. Is it possible for an Under Secretary to put all the different aspects of a case in each file within the time at his disposal, because he is expected to dispose of 40 files a day? It is impossible for them to dispose of files efficiently. An Under Secretary will get criticised if he is not up to the mark and if he does not dispose of 40 files a day. So he writes something and says that he has disposed of the fixed number of 40 files. If an Under Secretary is a man who is inclined to be haphazard and if he is not inclined to be very meticulous about details, then he will simply approve of whatever comes from the Head of the Department and will pass it on to the Secretary who will simply put his *chhota ruju* without going into the merits of the case. If an Under Secretary is inclined to be a little mischievous, a little leisurely and lacking in integrity, he can make common cause with the people who have initiated the correspondence. Under the present scheme of decentralisation of power, an Under Secretary is expected to dispose of 40 per cent of the work, a Deputy Secretary is expected to dispose of 20 per cent and the Secretary is expected to dispose of 16 per cent. There will be hardly 5 per cent left to be disposed of by the Minister. It looks as though the crumbs of power are thrown to the Minister. Having regard to all this I am quite certain in my mind that it is a very dangerous expedient to introduce this revised procedure.

In regard to the procedure for recruitment of Under Secretaries, here is a very ingenious way of getting rid of the difficulty of promotion to the Superintendents. Distinguished

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

graduates and double graduates are recruited as clerks in the Secretariat. They will have put in 15 years of service and they will be looking for promotion in the fullness of time when their chance comes. But by this system of direct recruitment you take away whatever chances there were for promotion for these officials. What incentive do you expect from the Superintendents and First Division Clerks who have devoted themselves exclusively to the work of the Secretariat for a period of so many years? We have developed a system of efficient-case workers who are the glory of this country. I remember, Sir Ramaswamy Mudaliar who happened to be the Chairman of the U.N.O. Secretariat once said that the case worker of Mysore was equal to the best case worker in any world organisation Secretariat.

To say that such people should be deprived of their opportunities for promotion in the Secretariat is a thing which is preposterous, which is unthinkable and which is going to lead to heart-burning, bickering, jealousy and a lot of inefficiency in the service. About recruitment of Under Secretaries, in one paragraph he has referred to the fact that they have to be recruited by a competitive examination and as a result of a *viva voce* conducted by the Chief Secretary himself individually. It looks quite fantastic that there should be such a system of selection of some of the important officers of the Secretariat by one man. He wants to bypass the Public Service Commission and all canons of social justice in the matter of recruitment to the higher grades. In a democracy what is the idea in the selection of people to the highest posts that one man should be given all the responsibility and what is the guarantee that nepotism and favouritism will not result, that inefficient people will not be recruited to the service and that people who are their own kith and kin will not be recruited? Do you think that in a democracy it is fair that any particular section of the community should be favoured at the expense of others? What else it will lead to if you make

it one-man show and deprive the Public Service Commission of its privilege of selecting officers on the basis of merit, qualifications, aptitude and special skill? By what stretch of imagination did my friend Sri Gorwala think that this system would be acceptable to any civilized and organised Government? I cannot understand. This is one of the things which must be put down with a firm hand. Whether it be the Treasury Benches or the Opposition, none will be ready to accept any kind of system where this privilege is sought to be vested in one man, however eminent he may be. Under the new scheme, there is much scope for a large number of persons with shorthand senior and typewriting senior qualifications. Today the market for senior typewriting and senior shorthand people is rather limited. When I happened to be the Secretary of the Recruitment Board, there was a glut in the market and people thought that there would be no more jobs. This new scheme will favour the appointment of people with senior shorthand and senior typewriting qualifications. Please excuse me for being a little communal-minded. There is a lot of dearth of stenographers and shorthand people among the backward communities. On account of the dearth of these people, a number of members of a particular community will be sneaked into the service on the ground of non-availability of qualified persons. Do you want to perpetuate this state of affairs? In the matter of recruitment of stenographers I am afraid it is likely to lead to a lot of this kind of patronage, jobbery and all that. You should not encourage it.

My friend Sri Gorwala has referred to the fact that in the matter of promotions there should be no reference to communal considerations at all. I do not know what made him think so. He has also said in one portion of the Report that in the Mysore State as against the Madras Government there seems to be a lot of discrimination against the members of a particular community in regard to recruitment. I do not know who gave him this fantastic information. What is laid down in the Constitution about reservation for



SRI A. D. GORWALA

backward communities and Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes we are following as a normal pattern of administration. There is no special order applicable to the Mysore State. Yet, he makes a reference that in the Mysore State there is a particular disadvantage to a particular community. I do not know on what basis he has made these observations. Whatever that is, the Public Service Commission cannot be divested of its privilege of recruitment. In the past I know that promotion had got to be made on the basis of merit, seniority and qualifications. Even today the position is that it is only on the considerations of seniority, merit and qualifications that promotions are made in the Secretariat. When that is the case, here is an observation made by my friend Sri Gorwala that communal considerations are counting in the administration of the Mysore State. It is hardly fair and just to make such a remark. Having regard to the fact that only on considerations of merit the Superintendents and First Division Clerks will get promotion, do you think that they will have the remotest chance of being promoted? You will see how it will react on those people.

As a result of the introduction of the new scheme, I visualise that as many as 44 officials will be thrown out of the Secretariat. The scale of establishment is indicated in the Gazette of October 1958. Calculating on that basis, at the rate of 6 Under Secretaries for each section, you will require quite an army of Under Secretaries—nearly 153 and about 448 officials will be thrown out of employment. The only alternative for them is either to go to the districts or to the department or to some other place as Head Clerks or Head Accountants of Taluk offices. What is to be their fate? It becomes very difficult administratively to see that these people are adjusted in the various districts.

One important point I wish to mention is that before this scheme is extended to other sections, I want a committee of competent officials who have had experience of Secretariat administration with one or two

representatives of the Houses of Legislature to be asked to go into this new scheme and assess its real worth on the basis of the experience gained during the last three months and if it is found as a result of the findings of that committee that this scheme has been successful only then should Government extend it to other sections. Otherwise, the Government should put a stop to it. I can mention the names a few people who are competent to be on that committee but I leave that job to the Government and stop at that.

So much about the Secretariat.

He has made some observations about the Secretariat atmosphere being like a fortune-teller's stand. It is hardly worthy of notice because the whole report bristles with this kind of uncalled for, petty, cheap and vulgar remarks. I consider it beneath my dignity to deal with them.

On page 51 he has made out a big case for continuing the posts of Divisional Commissioners and calls them expeditors. I am reminded of the expression "catalytic agent." At every stage if you want to have these expeditors, who are the expeditors of Ministers? A large body of opinion has been expressed both on the floor of the Legislative Assembly and the Council that they are like the fifth wheel in the coach and that Government will save in the neighbourhood of Rs. 9 lakhs per annum if they discontinue these people. This man suggests that they may be continued as they would be the correct agency to secure greater emotional integration. At the same time he wants to secure economy in administration. What are the specific functions that these people are doing? There is another remark which is rather more dangerous and that is that in the matter of appointment of Divisional Commissioners you need not care for seniority. God help us; ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದ ಏಕೈಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ. Anybody can be put as a Divisional Commissioner even though he is not a senior officer. Is that the suggestion? If so God help us!! Is that kind of recommendation which is acceptable to Government? So far as this section of the House is concerned, we emphatically repudiate any suggestion

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

to make the Divisional Commissioner anybody without seniority, still less we are against the continuance of the post of Divisional Commissioner.

SRI T. MARIAPPA.—The idea is perhaps to make it a selective job.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Without any sense of contradiction, I am quite definite in my mind that these Divisional Commissioners are doing precious little. That is the view of all right thinking people. On the other side, on account of party loyalty they don't want to express it.

SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—On a point of personal explanation. Whether there should be Divisional Commissioner or not, does not come within the party discipline. It is a matter of administrative detail. We are also equally of opinion that these Divisional Commissioners' offices make for delay. I wrote a letter to one of the Divisional Commissioners two years back and he has still not disposed of the file.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I have already referred to page 11 of the Report. He has made a very nasty reference to legislators. "Saddening indeed is it to find some members of the Legislature complaining not against this waste, but against their not being invited to assist in it on a particular occasion." What does he take us to be? Is the word 'absurd' unparliamentary? If it is, I won't use it. Then I must say that it is grossly absurd to make a reference to us in this way. We are people who represent nearly a lakh of people in the Mysore State and if we do not assert ourselves and if we cannot maintain our prestige, do we want Gorwala to find us alive to the responsibilities? Even granting that we ask for invitation from Government, it is a matter between us and the Government. Why should an outsider interfere in this business? I have already referred to the question of the Prime Minister being invited and the Governor being asked to spend money for his entertainment. These are all samples of the petty mindedness of a man who refers to these things. On page 13

there is one reference about which I feel sorry, that the tours of the Ministers and high officials become a burden upon the poor subordinate officials. I thought it was a thing which was only in the bureaucracy, but I am rather sorry to hear that when 100 per cent popular Government is in power, the poor officials in the villages or taluks should be burdened by the visits of these Ministers and officers. Here is a case in which Government will have to be very firm. I understand that Mr. Gorwala was told that when Ministers went out, Revenue Inspectors and other officials had to spend quite a lot of money. I presume it is not true and if it is not true in the case of Ministers, I still presume it is not true in the case of officers of Government. To come and make a regular point about it and say that the entire hierarchy of officers who get fat salaries go and squat on poor shanbagues and poor clerks, is a thing very damaging to the reputation of the entire official hierarchy. I must protest against this. On page 14 of the Report, he has made a misleading statement that we in Mysore are very charitable and generous and we welcome the incoming of a large number of I.C.S. people. This must be a figment of his imagination. I want to know how he has classified Mysoreans as people disposed to welcome more I.C.S. officers into the Mysore territory. When there was not a single Indian Civil Service man in the administration, we were at the top of the ladder in the matter of efficiency and reputation and I think it is only for the last 2½ years due to bad luck with the incoming of an Indian Civil Service officer our reputation is lowest and in the language of my friend it is at the worst. I won't say anything which is not true. He himself says that the reputation of the Secretariat is at the worst. He has stated somewhere that it is at the worst level. Now such being the case, we do not want, at least personally I am against, any more I.C.S. men being imported into the Secretariat for the simple reason that the Mysore officers who are all of the Administrative cadre can be equal to the I.C.S. men and the old Mysore Civil Service people to-day

SRI A. D. GORWALA

who are in charge of various offices have done credit to themselves. It is only their bad luck that they have not been selected for the Indian Administrative Service, but they are rendering yeoman's service.

Talking about the policy of appointments, I have already mentioned that somebody has misled him by saying that in the Mysore administration merit and seniority have not been taken into account but only communal consideration. Once again here is a case where he has been misled and he has been misinformed and I do not think that that statement is correct.

With regard to the delegation and decentralisation of powers of the Ministers, I have already referred to what appears on page 18: 'The classical saying on this subject is "Do not keep a dog and bark yourself".' My friend must be under a wrong impression that the responsibility of Ministers ends in merely formulating a policy. That is, I think, an understanding of democracy wrongly. It is not merely the responsibility of the Ministry to formulate a policy, but it is the responsibility of the Ministry to see that that policy is implemented at the appropriate time in the appropriate manner so that the benefit of it may accrue to the people for whom it is intended. That is democracy. And to say "You simply distribute the power, decentralise it, keep only 5 per cent, don't ascertain what has happened, don't behave like a dog barking"—if that is the way in which democracy is understood, then woe be unto democracy! But it appears to me that on the floor of the Legislature and before the public eye the Ministers have to hold themselves responsible for what happens in every department under their authority, which comes within their portfolio. Even if the head of a department is inefficient, is corrupt, so far as the administration of that department is concerned, the Minister takes the responsibility and it is up to the Ministers to be the watchdogs; to use the expression of my friend, they must be very effective watchdogs; they need not bark, they may do silent work and see that efficiency is secured.

SRI T. MARIAPPA.—For the mistakes of Secretaries, the Ministers often quit. Therefore, the responsibility is of the Ministers.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Therefore, his concept of democracy and his approach to the solution of problems of democracy are very wrong.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dr. R. Nagan Gowda).—I would like to know how much more time you require.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I want at least one hour more.

MR. CHAIRMAN.—You have spoken for almost an hour.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I have got 23 points in all to be covered. So far as this subject is concerned, there is no restriction of time.

MR. CHAIRMAN.—I don't want to restrict, but I want you to be concise.

SRI G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—We presume that it will continue to-morrow.

4 P.M.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, in regard to the subject of Finance, though there is nothing very strikingly original that my friend Mr. Gorwala has suggested, I think, once again a very wrong and misleading impression has been created by his suggestion that non-plan items of expenditure have been included and he has made a very wise suggestion that it may be avoided. About this non-plan expenditure, I think the advice has come from the Government of India and the Planning Commission, and on the floor of the House, the Hon'ble Minister for Finance has made a statement, that such plan and non-plan development schemes—several items of expenditure—dovetail into the Plan. It has been mentioned by the Planning Commission. I do not know why my friend Mr. Gorwala should display his colossal ignorance of what exactly is the amount of non-plan expenditure and what exactly is the amount of plan expenditure and how the inclusion of this non-plan expenditure has been agreed to by the Planning Commission. I will leave it at that.

Here is another instance where his Report is misleading and is not related

As I suggested already, my approach to this is that these hostels are not meant for backward communities only. I said general hostels. Poverty is there

Will Sir, there is a very funny statement again, which has given a very misleading impression—on page 27—that there is over-staffing in various district offices, in taluk offices and in divisional offices. Sir, it must be apparent to every Hon'ble Minister who tours the State, to every Head of the Department who tours the districts that the constant complaint is that in taluk offices the delay is due to lack of sufficient personnel, that they want additional clerks, that the Tah-illar also wants a typist, that he wants an intelligent clerk to carry on correspondence with the district office, that in the divisional office, they are understaffed. When that is the case, I do not know who gave him this information that in every divisional office, that in every district office and that in every taluk office, there is over-staffing. I want to know

SRI A. D. GORWALA

what is the yard-stick with which he judges that there is over-staffing. Before he made a statement, there must be some basis for the facts mentioned. In the absence of the mention of such facts, it must be said that it is merely an imaginative report that he has written.

In regard to the recovery of taxes—on page 37—I want a clarification from the Government and specially from the Hon'ble the Minister for Finance. He says that in regard to the recovery of conversion fine, as much as 75 lakhs of rupees are outstanding within the limits of the Bangalore City Municipality. He says that the Commissioner of the Corporation told him that after five years of the employment of special staff the arrears had mounted up to 75 lakhs, (*vide* Commissioner's letter, dated 21st December 1957). I want to know how this matter did not find a place in the official report of the Hon'ble Minister for Finance while presenting the Budget Estimates. Possibly, subsequent recoveries have been made. Whether these 75 lakhs are included in the recoveries is a matter for clarification. It is one of the points which requires to be clarified and a reply given.

Talking of industries, I want to touch upon the point of withdrawal of capital. What surprises me mostly—on page 40, my friend does not want any more investments from the Government of Mysore in respect of development of industries. "The resources of the Government of Mysore are already fully pledged and further investment, partial or entire, in new industries should ordinarily be avoided." Well, Sir, it is striking at the very root of any progress for the development of Mysore. Sir, in a state of developing economy, when we have been making suggestions to become an enlarged State and when there are various natural resources of the country to be developed and when there are various industries to be strengthened, here is a man who says, please do not invest a single pie. What is to happen to the economic development and the progress of the State of Mysore if we do not invest more money? In

the terms of reference, which the Chief Minister has read, he wanted to know what exactly are the future lines of expansion and industrialisation. Is this an answer to the terms of reference? I wish I had known all the terms of reference and I would have made my observations accordingly. Here is a man who gives the direct lie to the need for industrial expansion of the State. He says something which is different from the terms of reference. However, I would be not a party to a statement like this—however deficit the finances of a State may be, I am quite willing to support any measure calculated to industrialise the country, because we live in hopes. If today we start an industry, which has a promise of adequate return, which has a promise of yielding a fair return some day, I say we should support it. Because we have no finance, do you want the progress of industrialisation to be stopped? Is that the suggestion of my friend Mr. Gorwala? If that is so, that report is not worth the paper on which it is printed. I will stop at that with regard to industries.

While suggesting various improvements at the Secretariat level, I want to know, how this question of the Chief Secretary being the Development Commissioner of the State and how the Additional Development Commissioner of the State being the Secretary to the Government in the Planning and Development Department, escaped the critical eye of my friend Sri Gorwala. It is not a very healthy system to have the Chief Secretary to Government as the Development Commissioner of the State. I want to make one concrete suggestion and I want the Government to give serious consideration to that. The chief defect in the present administration is the glorification of one particular individual as the Chief Secretary to Government. I want the Government to seriously consider the question of substituting him by what is called a Cabinet Secretary. Let there be no question of bigness or smallness among the Secretaries. The Secretaries are the people who must enjoy an equal status. There was a time when the

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

Government had seriously contemplated and had almost taken a decision to appoint a Cabinet Secretary who enjoys the confidence of the Ministry. Even now, I think that you must seriously consider changing the Chief Secretary and appointing in his stead, a Cabinet Secretary. The chief allegation now is that all Secretaries look to the Chief Secretary as a man from whom they can get inspiration and that they should take the cue from him and obey him. If there is loss of initiative, it is because there is one to take the initiative. He has made a statement that all Secretaries were in the habit of submitting files to the Chief Secretary in old Mysore. Sir, here is one man who can emphatically repudiate the suggestion. I was myself Revenue Secretary to Government, and I was doing the work of four Secretaries of the present day in point of volume and I had never submitted the files to the Chief Secretary, unless it was a Cabinet matter; where I wanted the orders of Ministers, I used to submit the files direct to the Ministers concerned. If after the Minister had passed orders, if it had not to go to the Cabinet, it was passed on to the Chief Minister as head of the Administration. But, unless it is a cabinet matter, it would not be sent to the Chief Secretary. But here, it is stated that the previous system and even the procedure was that every file was going to the Chief Secretary and I want to know if there was any warrant for this suggestion either in the Secretariat Manual or the existing Rules. At any rate, I might have been a defaulter but I am certain in my mind that there was no need to send files to the Chief Secretary unless it was a Cabinet matter.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIA.—No Chief Secretary became so powerful and all dominating.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA (Tumkur).—Probably it started during your period.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I am only seriously concerned with all that is happening subsequent to the incoming of the Indian Civil Service man as Chief Secretary to Government. I know this because, in connection with

this new system in the Secretariat office procedure, there were one or two Secretaries to Government who expressed themselves freely against the efficacy of the system and they were suitably dealt with by the Chief Secretary. My information is that the Chief Secretary who was perhaps the co-author of this new system asked a particular Secretary near him to give his own views on the new system and that particular Secretary was asked to withdraw and he was not even given an opportunity to express and explain himself, a right which was guaranteed to him under the Constitution. I tell you categorically that this system should not be perpetuated any longer. Let Government seriously consider the question of substitution of a Cabinet Secretary. Sir, in addition to this, the suggestion of Mr. Gorwala is that the Chief Secretary should be the Inspector-General (on page 49) of prisons and of posts and telegraphs. He wants to make him Inspector-general-General. I do not know what it is to make him an Inspector-General and he wants a Special Secretary so that he may freely go about in the country. He wants to make all the Divisional Commissioners, non-entities. He wants the Heads of Departments to be non-entities. And what distresses me most is that he wants to reduce these Ministers as puppets. He wants the Inspector-General to go about the entire country with a Special Secretary at the headquarters. Would you be a party to accept this kind of a recommendation? In view of all this, Sir, I say, you have to read these recommendations between lines before you can make up your mind on this Report. In any case, I would not accept the proposal of this Inspector-General and the continuance of this Chief Secretary to tour outside, a Special Secretary to be appointed—in one sense, you want to discontinue a number of second division clerks and increase the number of Under-Secretaries. I want to ask, what is the work that the Deputy Secretaries are doing? Why should there be Deputy Secretaries? I would rather have more Under Secretaries and reduce the number of



SRI A. D. GORWALA

Deputy Secretaries. The whole thing is giving a confusing picture. It looks as a whole that the Report is drawn up to favour a few people and to show some favours to some people. That is the entire scheme and that is how it appears to me.

SRI T. MARIAPPA.—I want to submit, Sir, that even now, all papers do not go to the Chief Secretary.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Then who is the officer who gave him this information? Who are the people who took him into confidence and treated him as partners ...

SRI T. MARIAPPA.—In many cases, the Deputy Secretaries send the files direct to the Ministers.

SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Before the Secretaries send files to the Ministers, the Chief Secretary is invariably consulted and he writes on the file.

SRI H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Minister for Public Works and Electricity).—Who said so? If the Hon'ble Member will please yield, you are not basing your opinions on facts.

SRI G. N. PUTTANNA.—That is the talk.

SRI H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—If it is street talk, does it become of an Hon'ble Member of this House to believe that that is followed in practice?

SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I have reason to doubt that Secretaries are invariably taken into confidence by the Chief Secretary and he even writes on files which normally need not go to him.

SRI H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—It is open to the Hon'ble Member to draw his own conclusion. But when the Government makes a categorical statement, it is for the Hon'ble Members to accept it.

SRI T. MARIAPPA.—Because, often-times there is no time-lag. As soon as the Deputy Secretary notes, it is straightaway sent to the Minister concerned.

SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, much as they want to safeguard their

reputation, and I want it to be safe guarded, the fact is that the Chief Secretary dominates the whole show.

SRI H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—If you entertain that opinion, we cannot help it.

MR. CHAIRMAN.—I think it will be better if the Ministers would give a consolidated reply.

SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Why should they lose their temper? If they perhaps seek for a vote, on this point, I think the whole House will vote. It is the conscience of the entire House.

SRI H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—We never wanted to take a vote on this or on any point.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I am afraid my Hon'ble friend, the Minister for Public Works, has not had sufficient time to read the Gorwala Report. The remarks made by my friend, Sri Hanumanthaiya lend colour if you read some portions of the Report. I will read one paragraph. Page 46 :

"The habit of wanting to see all or almost all files into which some Ministers and Secretaries fall, (the Chief Secretary falls in this category), obsessed by their belief but in their own capacity (and greatness) cannot but be deplored. Such men need not be Secretaries (or Chief Secretaries) and Deputy Secretaries capable of applying their minds to and deciding cases, but mere amanuenses (this means that persons merely write their notes to dictation) standing around to note with awe whatever falls from the master's lips. They destroy in their subordinates both initiative and the desire to work. Few sights are more tragic than that of the good Secretary or Deputy Secretary in the grip of such a Minister or Secretary."

These are facts. I only wanted to say that there was sufficient justification for such an inference on the basis of the Gorwala Report.

SRI H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—If you accept the Gorwala Report as it is, Sri Hanumanthaiya is correct.

**Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.**—I would be the last to accept the Gorwala Report. In fact if the House agrees, I would propose a vote of censure against the Report and stop at this stage. I will not go further at all. I do not want to continue it at all, for, at this stage, I would like to stop if the House cares to pass a censure motion against him which I will bring up. My Hon'ble friend Sri Gorwala has suggested the abolition of the State Academy of Dance, Music and Drama. Sir, my feelings were rather disturbed because of this reason that I happened to be the author of a scheme for introducing the Academy of Dance, Music and Drama. It has got a history by itself. I do not wish to say anything about its history. But at a time when the whole of the country is devoting itself to the development of aesthetic sentiments of the people, to see that our cultural heritage is developed to the fullest extent possible, to see that the creative abilities of our boys and girls and men and women are developed, here is a man who says that even this amount of Rs. 76,000, not even lakhs, should be deleted.

**ಶ್ರೀ ಚ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.**—ಮುಂದಿನ ವಾಕ್ಯ ನೋಡಿ. "In a State like this there is sufficient private encouragement to these arts for them to flourish."

**ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯಾ.**—ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೇ! ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಏನು ಲಲಿತ ಕಲೆಗಳು ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಆಗಿದ್ದರೂ, ಅವು ರಾಜಾಶ್ರಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಳೆದು ಬಂದವೆ. ಈಗ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸೀಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜಾಶ್ರಯ ಹೋಗಿ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಜಾ ಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ಜನಗಳೇ ಅವನ್ನು ಬೆಳೆಸಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬಂದವೆ. ಜನಗಳು ಎಲ್ಲೆಯವರೆಗೆ ಬಡವರು ಆಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೋ, ಎಲ್ಲೆಯವರೆಗೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ತಿನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಸ್ತಿ, ಹೊದ್ದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಟ್ಟೆ, ವಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ಮನೆ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

People who have devoted their whole life time for drama, music and dance are in the streets without two square meals. I have been agitating for the development of a full-fledged modern theatre with up-to-date appliances, in a city like Bangalore; I have been pleading for opening open-air theatres in several districts; I have asked for special schools for theatrical training, but to say that even this pittance of

Rs. 76,000 should be abolished, I must say that apart from this kind of vulgar excuse, he seems to lack the aesthetic sense. I do not know what prompted him to make such a report. Anyway, let not the Government make an excuse for reducing this grant. There is justification for increasing this grant.

**Sri T. MARIAPPA.**—At least he recognises that people here encouraged.

**ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯಾ.**—ಎಲ್ಲೆಂದೆರಡೇಕೆ! ಯಾವ ಊರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಕೊಟಿ ದ್ದಾರೆ! ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಜನ ಮನೆ ಮಠ ಕಳೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

**Sri T. PARTHASARATHY (Mallawaram).**—On a point of order. The other day, the Chair was pleased to observe that no personal remark should be made against Sri Gorwala.

**Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.**—Well Sir, my point is, a distinction will have to be made between a bouquet and a brickbat; where my friend Sri Hanumanthappa should have got bouquets for putting up this Vidhana Soudha structure, he got brickbats; where a man deserves brickbats, what does it matter if brickbats and stones are thrown at him? Here is a man who asks for it just like the Government who has asked for all his remarks by inviting him. I have not even seen the gentleman. But I will not yield to anybody where the prestige of the State is involved. The entire administrative machinery, the entire public, the legislators, ministers, officials, clerks, heads of departments, he has slung mud against the faces of all these people. Do you mean to say that we can put up with all this? The Government is a party to it. I am surprised, the Hon'ble the Finance Minister is a party to this document.

**Sri T. MARIAPPA.**—Please listen to me; unfortunately we are parties to his appointment.

**Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.**—To his disappointment. Please don't repeat this performance. That is all I can say. Well, Sir, then coming to page 63 about Public Works, there are very astounding revelations made for as many as 13,261 works costing Rs. 13 crores and odd no estimates had been prepared. Is this true? Who gave this information? If it is true, what further action had been taken by the Hon'ble the Chief

SRI A. D. GORWALA

Minister? This is what is stated: "It appears that for quite a number of the works undertaken, no estimates are prepared." What is the value and what is the number of those estimates? The subsequent sentence gives an impression that it is a shocking state of affairs. Has the Government applied its mind to the statement on page 63, paragraph 1, and if so, what exactly are the results? Why is it that the statement furnished by the Hon'ble Minister for Revenue does not mention what is the decision taken by the Government on this point? What is the reply to this kind of allegation made against the Government? Why does it not find a place in the statement of replies?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I will give the reply.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am glad that the Hon'ble Minister for Public Works seems to forget the existence of joint responsibility. The Hon'ble Minister for Revenue was in charge of the Debate when we discussed on the Report of Gorwala. Then he made a statement that out of 90 points raised by Sri Gorwala, so many points had been accepted and so many had been rejected and so on. I have watched the debate but a reply to this particular point which slings mud at the face of the Public Works Ministry does not find a statement.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—He has only made a statement of facts copying figures from the Estimates Committee Audit Report and simply placed it there.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—The Hon'ble Minister may give his reply at the end. It is better that the Member proceeds.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It is further stated there: "The execution of works without preparation of estimates must lead to wastage and is clear evidence of slackness in supervision." Is that true? Next coming to same section relating to Public Works, he has also given certain statistics in regard to establishment charges in respect of some of the major projects, both irrigation and construction of buildings. He says that the establishment charges have gone up in some cases to 15 per cent. He says this in

relation to what has been done elsewhere. I want the Public Works Minister to tell me in respect of major irrigation projects which were considered to have been very economical—I do not compare them with reference to Hirakud and Damodar Valley Projects where there is such a lot of wasteful expenditure when compared with other projects in other States or other projects which have been completed within the minimum cost—what is the percentage of establishment expenditure to total cost. About technical audit, it is one of those points with which I entirely agree and it must be said to his credit that this technical audit cell has got to be established.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Even before he suggested, we were already contemplating to have it. Even before he put it on paper, we were already at it.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, in regard to the co-operative sugar factories, I do not know if my friend Sri Gorwala is aware of the future trends of industrialisation, particularly in regard to consumer industries. He is against the idea of Government subsidising or encouraging or sponsoring co-operative enterprise in the field of industry. He wants possibly to see that expenditure in this behalf is minimised. It is a question of policy on which the Government will have to express themselves very freely. But speaking for myself, I consider that there are certain sectors of industrialisation where co-operation is one of those things which definitely lends itself in an admirable manner for the promotion of industries. Having regard to that, I consider that those views do not deserve any consideration. Well, Sir, talking about this Information Department, I have had enough to say during the debates both on the General Budget and in connection with the Governor's Address. Here is a Department which has not justified its existence. The whole point is there is no flair for publicity so far as the Government of Mysore is concerned.

4-30 P.M.

He says that the English Bulletin should be stopped. How else is the

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

whole country to know what exactly we in Mysore are doing? If a thing is bad, improve it. But to say that the English Bulletin should be stopped and that we must cut out all contacts with the rest of India, is something positively unacceptable. I do not understand what exactly is the significance of this kind of suggestion he makes in his Report. If he says it should be in Hindi there was some justification for saying that because it would reach all other parts of the country. But he does not say so. He is referring to one particular section which I have marked in red pencil. "Tickling the vanity of those whose achievements are recorded can obviously not be regarded as a public purpose." I think it is a dig at the Ministers. But somehow, whether the Ministers like it or not, they publish ugly looking photographs of Ministers, including the most handsome Minister for Public Health (*Laughter*). Luckily for all of us none of the members of the Opposition figure in any of these photographs that had appeared in the Information Bulletin. I have presided over functions with a gathering of 8 to 12 thousand and not a single report appears in the official Bulletin for the simple reason that I did not want that to be publicised nor had I any inclination or intention to send a report. That does not matter. After all our Ministers deserve to be publicised, deserve to be made prominent. I only regret that the Information Department is not one which is doing its work effectively. Please see that the Information Department gets a man who has a flair for publicity. I have no desire to criticise the man in charge. After all the man in charge has his own limitations. It may be that he is a good writer. But publicity is an art in itself. In fact he must be a nice official drummer boy. He must speak about the achievements of Government even where there are none. (*Laughter*).

SRI T. MARIAPPA.—We do not want publicity for things which we have not done.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I have done it.

SRI T. MARIAPPA.—He has done it wonderfully well in those days.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Then he refers to the stream of booklets in English called 'Facts about Mysore' which was one of the things I criticised as containing statistics which had no value, which had to be characterised as statistics dealing with wild life. I am glad that Sri Gorwala—one notable exception—has said publication of 'Facts about Mysore' should be discontinued. It contains statistics of no value and the man in charge has no imagination. It is much better that this Government does not get disgraced by publishing false statistics. I had occasion to bring to the notice of the Chief Minister that even in the Governor's Address certain facts were mentioned which would not bring credit. I consider Governor's address as an authoritative document and for errors to creep into it does not do credit to any Government. So far as the Information Department is concerned I want this Government to have it as a most effective, most useful and purposeful department, to be manned by people who are trained because it is a highly specialised scientific business. In fact in western countries they give thousands of dollars for people who have been trained. It is a job which requires a lot of study, preparation and there are many institutes all over the world which will give training for the Information Department.

Next he has referred to a sum of Rs. 18,000 being spent by the Bhadravati Iron and Steel Works on a special supplement. I am afraid there is no sense of proportion in a criticism of that kind. The Bhadravati Iron Works is yielding a profit of one crore and 25 lakhs. Government have been showing it as only 85 lakhs and there is no justification for criticising a department which has made a wonderful job of it. My friend Sri Shamanna, when he was the General Manager, raised it to one crore, and Government, after adjustments, have been showing it as only 83 lakhs. Even there the principle involved is that in the development works there is a fixed proportion of percentage of expenditure to be incurred and

SRI A. D. GORWALA

profits to be made. It is the case in all industrial concerns whether in the public sector or private sector. Even now, after four years of retirement I am getting beautiful fountain-pens, pocket note-books with beautiful gold tip and all that. So it is not much and to make that as a point for criticism of the policy of publicising of the Mysore Government is not fair.

In regard to the Public Service Commission, page 59, he raises a very fundamental issue. What is given to them under the Constitution my friend Sri Gorwala seems to deny or take away from the Public Service Commission. He suggests that the scope of the work of the Public Service Commission must be restricted to the appointments of gazetted officers only leaving the recruitment of non-gazetted officers to several departments of Government to Divisional Commissioners. He has not made even a suggestion, as Sri Suryanarayana Rao stated, that members of the Public Service Commission should be associated. I am afraid that offends against the Constitution. If my friend had made a suggestion that with a view to accommodate thousands of candidates who apply for several jobs and who have got to make a pilgrimage to Bangalore involving considerable expenditure that it must hold its sessions in several divisions, and that you must increase the number of members on the Public Service Commission so that they may migrate to several divisional headquarters, that is a different thing to say; but to take away the power that is vested under the Constitution is something which I cannot understand. It surprises me how a man like Sri Gorwala could have made this kind of a suggestion.

On page 73 he refers to the progress of work in N.E.S. and C.D. Blocks. For myself, and on behalf of the entire members of the Opposition and also on behalf of quite a large number of Members on the Treasury Benches, I must say that we have made the worst criticisms about the N.E.S. and C.D. Blocks, but we have never lost sight of the fact that the future pattern of the development

of the country-side and the development of the country as a whole is in the direction of rural reconstruction. In all our criticisms we have only criticised that these Ministers give N.E.S. and C.D. blocks to places where the Congress people have been elected. That is one of our usual criticisms which may be true or which may not be.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It is not true.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Recently the Chief Minister presided over a function where they have given these blocks to two taluks where both the representatives elected are from the Congress. During the time of my friend Sri Nijalingappa, I wrote saying that I wished to make Nanjangud as an ideal block for C.D. and N.E.S., and that we had an army of 123 graduates and non-graduates, men imbued with a spirit of service. I am not requesting as a legislator or to boost that after I became a legislator I got C.D. and N.E.S. block for Nanjangud. I want to know on what basis the distribution of blocks is made. Our criticism was not for scrapping the entire N.E.S. and C.D. Blocks. But our criticism was based on the fact that you selected your own people, Congressmen or Congress-minded or sponsored by the Congress, ignoring the Opposition benches, which is abundantly true. We never said or wanted that the N.E.S. and C.D. blocks should be scrapped. Then what remains?

It is impossible to visualise. Many foreign experts, many teams of the U.N.O., who have gone into this question have praised with one voice the phenomenal progress made by the Government of India and the several State Governments. There are inherent defects, of course. None can deny that. If Mr. Gorwala had found any faults in the working of the schemes, I would have supported him. I am afraid that I cannot be a party to this kind of wholesale indictment of the policy of rural development. If we ignore rural development, what remains? The reasons that impelled Mr. Gorwala to decry community schemes are apparent. I am going to prove that he

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

has no faith in democratic decentralisation or the various self-governing local institutions.

Coming to Village Panchayats and Taluks Boards, it is very clear that my friend Mr. Gorwala has absolutely no faith or belief in democratic decentralisation. The inference is obvious. Having been trained to a tradition of 'bossing and glossing' as I called it, he does not see much usefulness in the panchayats. But as a person who has been associated with the Village Panchayat movement from the year 1927,—indeed I had a hand in drafting the Village Panchayat Bill,—and one who has seen the fluctuating fortunes of the development of village panchayats, a statement which suggests that the village panchayats should not be given additional impetus and that we should give the go-by to rural development, is saddening indeed. My heart suffers pangs from this kind of unjustifiable remarks. Mr. Gorwala says that by assigning regular land revenue to the tune of Rs. 55 lakhs, Government is wasting money. I would like to know what exactly is his picture of the rural side what he wants the future of our villages to be. Are we going to train people for working the democracy? If we are not going to find and train our future workers in the village panchayats or at the taluk level, whereelse are we to find them? I cannot understand the mentality of this person whose approach is entirely different. I do not wish to make any further remarks, but I completely disassociate myself with this approach.

On page 41, Mr. Gorwala has made an uncharitable remark which I resent. It is against our Ministers.

MR. CHAIRMAN.—You are going back.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It is all 'rock and roll', Sir. The whole thing is mixed up. I am coming to the end of my remarks.

Here is a statement directed against the Ministers, including the distinguished Chief Minister and the Finance Minister. It is said: "Most Secretaries seek to take shelter under the Chief

Secretary's wing rather than to act as independent Secretaries themselves, thus greatly adding to the former's burden. Perhaps this is a carry over from the pre-independence Mysore system when all papers went through." I have already given the lie to this remark. He continues, "Perhaps also, it is the result of ten years work under masters with no very clear ideas of standards of work." Sir, this gentleman has sought to criticise the entire batch of administrators from 1947 onwards. To say that the entire lot of them is useless, cannot find support from any quarter.

Sir, on page 68, my friend Sri Gorwala wants a 'striking force'. I am afraid that this strikes me in the face. There seems to be a protracted correspondence between the Home Department of the Government of Mysore and the I.G. of Police. I do not know why this exchange of correspondence is going on. The proposal should be nipped in the bud. The proposal involves an expenditure of 9.65 lakhs recurring and 7.18 lakhs non-recurring. I would like to ask if there is the least justification for calling this Government a Welfare State if they implement this scheme. Or is it a Police State? What decision have the Government taken on this? Have they stated that they outright reject the idea? What is this striking force? What purpose would it serve? To strike whom? Is it that two constables should accompany the Ministers on tour or that a dozen policemen should lie in wait and receive Ministers when they alight from the car? Is it that the Ministers want more protection from the people? Is this scheme intended to strike the people? Did the I.G. of Police make an application to Mr. Gorwala stating that he was handicapped and that Mr. Gorwala should plead on his behalf for the sanction of a striking force?

I have already referred to the Chief Secretary being the Inspector General so that he may satisfy his vanity and so that he may glorify himself as the one man who has to be recognised by one and all throughout the length and breadth of this State. All others



SRI A. D. GORWALA

should look small before him. I am not prepared to accept that suggestion.

I would now refer to one important and significant remark that has upset me very badly. That is the opening paragraph itself. Mr. Gorwala did not get a reply to his letter and that is the reason there is a Vidhana Soudha scandal and therefore no one could expect morale in the administration. On behalf of the Opposition, I must tell you that we are not oblivious to what has happened. We have not lost sight of the fact that, so far as the Vidhana Soudha Enquiry report is concerned, we all have received copies of the report, but the point is that some other copies, I believe, were not put into our hands. We expected that Government would pass some orders. You set up a Committee of Enquiry. You summon witnesses, record evidence and get a report, but you do not pass orders. The usual procedure in respect of such reports should have been followed. The whole matter stands at a standstill and we are in the dark.

My friend Sri Hanumanthaiya has been the target of attacks. He has been offered brickbats from various sources. I am not going into the merits of the case. I am not going either to criticise him or support him. This building I consider is an achievement by itself. We may not agree with the type of architecture here and there, we may not agree with the amount of money that has been spent, but one thing remains that it is a monument of achievement by itself. If there are allegations against Sri Hanumanthaiya, let them have the courage to come into the open and proceed against him. Government have till today not said anything of the officers who were caught for gross misconduct. What is the good of this campaign of villification or a tirade against a single individual? I am not holding a brief for Sri Hanumanthaiya. We have disagreed on several occasions, but I must stress that this kind of villification against him must stop. Government must pass orders on the report. Till then we have no voice to talk. I hear that certain pensions have been reduced for some officers and certain persons

have been punished. We are completely in the dark about it. Yet this systematic villification of Sri Hanumanthaiya is going on. We have nothing personal against Sri Hanumanthaiya. But for this gentleman, Mr. Gorwala, to come and open his Report by saying we have forgotten it is to attack our sense of responsibility in Mysore.

I can teach a hundred Gorwalas and say what exactly is the duty of a man who is asked to make a report. If I am asked to make a report on this matter I can help the Government with a very good report as to how to improve the standard of administration. I am the worst critic of Government and I do not think anybody else has said worse things than myself about the Government, but I am interested in the progress of Mysore, in the fair name of Mysore, in the prestige of Mysore and I would do nothing which will lower the prestige of Government. If I have criticised Government it is entirely against this background. Let me not be misunderstood.

Thank you.

†SRI MAHMOOD SHARIFF (Broadway).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is not the first time when the Government Mysore had got drafted such reports as the one which is the subject matter of discussion today with a view to tone up the administration and minimise the expenditure. In this connection, long before the services of Sri Gorwala were secured, several committees consisting of individuals and groups of individuals who were good veterans in the official hierarchy as my friend Sri Gorwala were appointed to give the benefit of their experiences in this all-important work. There were committees under the chairmanship of Sir Bannerji, Sri B.S. Raghavendra Rao and Sri Chandrasekharaiah to give the benefit of their experience in this matter, but it is with regret that I have to say that as it has always happened with the Government, the Government instead of implementing the recommendations made by the several committees before, appointed more and more committees thus creating an impression in the mind of people that Government were not

(SRI MAHMOOD SHARIFF)

very serious in this matter, that they were fond of experimentation. The recommendations made by Sri Gorwala do not drastically show any new ideas but a mere rehash of the old recommendations.

Subject, however, to the observations made the other day by my friend Sri Kothavale that this report has been drafted by a person who was bred up so to speak in the bureaucratic atmosphere and that much water has flown below the bridge since that time, that new circumstances have come into being and that new outlooks have been developed, there are certain things which deserve serious consideration of the members of this House. Sri Gorwala had at the outset a feeling against the construction of Vidhana Soudha which he characterised as Vidhana Soudha Scandal. It is no doubt true that there was a burning controversy regarding the construction of Vidhana Soudha and the question as to whether from the aesthetic point of view this build was appropriate either for residential purposes or for housing the offices of such a big Government. It seems to me now that it is useless to make a fetish of this because this building is now a *fait accompli* and it provides to Mysore a very monumental building which has been attracting the attention not only of people belonging to Mysore but also of people belonging to other parts of India including the Central Government. I am told that there was a move to hold a session of Parliament in this building and that enquiries were made regarding availability of accommodation, etc., here. In order to satisfy the requirements of the southerners they wanted to hold a session of Parliament in this beautiful building. So I do not think that any useful purpose is going to be served by unearthing what my friend Sri Mallaradhy characterised as the antecedents of this committee although it is true that it was necessary for Government to place before the members of this House a succinct report about the findings of the committee appointed in pursuance of the agitation made in certain quarters. So far as the

recommendations made by Sri Gorwala are concerned, certainly they are good and if they are going to be translated into action it will not be ineffective to reach the goal which we have before us, namely, to minimise expenditure in connection with the carrying out of this administration. But let me say that no reform either in this matter or in any other matter is going to fructify unless those who are at the helm of affairs in the Government as well as those who constitute the official hierarchy feel that they are getting their living at the cost of the common man, that they have been appointed to serve their interests from a very humanitarian point of view and not from any monetary point of view. They say that democracy is the best form of Government that has ever come into existence with the intelligence of people, but democracy is going to fail unless it is manned by feeling persons, by first class persons who work very conscientiously. Unless that happens, no amount of recommendation is going to succeed in toning up the administration of Government.

In this connection, it was very strange and astonishing that some of my colleagues here said that in order to improve the tone of the Mysore administration it was very necessary to appoint certain I.C.S. officers. It was said that I.C.S. officers by reason of their antecedents, mental agility, discipline and other qualifications, would be helpful in improving the tone of our administration.

5 P.M.

I am sorry that this remark was made by some responsible colleague of mine, but unfortunately they forget that Mysore had the pride of place so far as administration is concerned. Mysore had the fortune of having intelligent people, feeling people, people who love their country. It is that thing that is wanted. There is nothing sacrosanct or sacred about the name of I.C.S. I for one feel that if there are any I.C.S. officers who belong to the steel frame of the British Raj, they should be driven away from this place. I say this with all sense of responsibility

SRI A. D. GORWALA

because I.C.S. people still retain that bureaucratic spirit and outlook. These people want to look down upon the people who created them as if they are Olympians. These people, forget that they owe their living to the common people; these people forget that even the Rajas and Maharajas have been swept away by the popular will. Should they not recognise that they are responsible to the people responsible to the common man and responsible to the members of this Legislature? So much was said regarding the Chief Secretary and other Secretaries. So much was said that so far as administration is concerned, it is dominated by the Chief Secretary. I do not want to discuss the pros and cons of this question. I, a person having some responsibility, have enquired into, and analysed the whole situation and got information and I say that something is wrong in the State of Denmark. Shakespeare says that so far as officers are concerned, they should not have the insolence of office. I appeal to the Ministers who are in charge of administration, to those who are at the head of departments and to those who are in the lower category of service to remember that it is their honour to work wholeheartedly and unstintingly for promoting the good of the common man.

Remarks were made regarding the inordinate delay that has been occurring so far as Government files are concerned. It is a thing which has been chronic so far as our Government is concerned. It is a thing which has been brought to the notice of all concerned. It has been brought to their notice that some files take years for being disposed of. I have got certain statistics to show that there is one case which took about 30 years to be disposed of. I have got them but unfortunately I have not brought them here. Instances like these are numerous and they do not redound to the credit of such a big administration. For example, in Mandya the arrears went up to lakhs of rupees and in spite of stringent action being taken by the officers concerned nothing was done to gather the expected yield. This is a thing

which does not redound to the credit of the Government. This question must be tackled, particularly when colossal amounts are needed in order to reconstruct our country.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—So far as Mandya is concerned, they have accumulated from 1935-36. We have taken steps recently to recover at least a major portion of the arrears.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—It is not recent case. A special officer was appointed and he has been collecting for the last 5 years. According to my information, they have collected Rs. 40 lakhs out of Rs. 80 lakhs.

Sri MAHMOOD SHARIFF.—What I want to point out is the inordinate delay which has occurred regarding these matters. I compliment the present Ministry for having taken stringent action in order to secure as much money as possible. The well-known saying is that justice delayed is justice denied. Although this applied to legal proceedings, suits and such other matters, it seems to me that it applies with greater force to administrative matters where heavy stakes are involved. Therefore, my request to the present Ministry is that so far as disposal of files is concerned some stringent action has to be taken. If that is not done, may I say with your permission, Sir, that it is disgraceful? When I had the privilege of supervising the activities of one particular department and I found that some very important matter had to be disposed of, I adopted one course of action. The three or four Ministers concerned sat together and in the course of one month everything was disposed of. As a matter of fact, I do know that about 10 to 15 big hospitals had to be opened and they had been promised for years together. In that particular year those 14 big hospitals were opened. Therefore, I suggest to my friends in the present Ministry—I do not question their enthusiasm—to gather together, come closer and see that big matters such as Sharavathi Valley Project and other matters are disposed of as early as possible.

Coming to the question of prohibition, I had the privilege of supervising the activities of prohibition Bill so far

(SRI MAHMOOD SHARIFF)

as Mysore was concerned. This is the burning question of the day. There are some people who feel that so far as prohibition is concerned, it is a very ethical and ideal thing but that unfortunately it has failed. There are others who say that it has not failed but is moving slowly. When the Health Ministers' Conference was held in Delhi and when it was inaugurated by our beloved Prime Minister, I asked a question 'Why is it they are giving a step-motherly treatment to this question of prohibition?' Pandit Nehru said "Go slow. Adopt go slow policy." I think it is very difficult for the addicts to give up the habit immediately. This is a habit which is cultivated for years; how is it possible for these addicts to give up this habit all on a sudden? It is only the next generation that may take complete advantage of this prohibition. Therefore, whatever may be the reasons for the failure of this prohibition policy, I feel that it is to be continued and extended to other places. In Kolar and other places where I have had the occasion to go and see things for myself, the womenfolk and ladies of the house are very happy. It may be slowly but surely it is going to be a success.

Regarding taxation and recovery of revenue, there is one thing which I wanted to place very humbly before the present Government. No doubt we will have to take steps in order to secure the arrears as much as possible, but for God's sake, do not impose any further taxation. We had a surfeit of them and people, whether they belong to higher income group or lower income group, are not in a position to bear the burden of further taxation. Particularly, merchants who may be likened to milch cows, who have been contributing a large share to the coffers of Government, have been completely disillusioned. It is impossible for them to bear any more taxation. The camel's back is going to break if they are going to impose any further taxation. Therefore, I would appeal to them to have this important aspect in view.

Mr. Gorwala says that only the most intelligent people, those who could

count on merit, they alone should be appointed, they alone should be made to man the show. I do not agree with him in this view. Certain communities have had the support for past several years and so far as the Constitution is concerned, it says that Government have to give all facilities to backward classes so that there may not be any inequality. According to the suggestion made by Mr. Gorwala, only those persons who are intellectually vital, mentally vital must be selected. Till such time that inequality is removed, it is not desirable to adopt this practice.

Regarding industries, my friend Mr. Mallaradhya has covered all aspects of the question. There is no doubt that Government are trying to man these industries; but this policy has to be stopped somewhere. The industrial policy of America, if studied, shows that it is only private agencies that have been carrying on the industries. The silk industry in Channapatna has dwindled down; it has been stopped because of the Government patronage. Suppose it had been continued by persons belonging to private agencies; I think they would have prospered.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It was not a Government concern purely but a joint stock concern.

Sri MAHMOOD SHARIFF.—Government had 51 per cent of the shares.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Only 10 per cent.

Sri MAHMOOD SHARIFF.—Somehow our feeling is that Government are going to bring all these industrial concerns under their control. We have to stop this policy. Why are you going to deny the people who have business acumen, people who could control with more efficiency, the opportunity to run such industries? Therefore, it is high time that as far as possible they are taken over by private agencies so that under their control things may improve.

With regard to education, one remark which Mr. Gorwala has made is really fine and that is, let private agencies conduct these institutions. Give them grant; why are you going to deny them?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Even in your time you had given grants to colleges

SRI A. D. GORWALA

SRI MAHMOOD SHARIFF.—Mysore University is the only University which has not taken advantage of the concession which the University Grants Commission wanted to give.

SRI C. K. RAJIAH SETTY (Chiknaikanahally).—The irony of it is that in the case of technical colleges, seats are sold. If Government have no check, what is the use of keeping them under private agency?

SRI MAHMOOD SHARIFF.—That is my observation.

Lastly, I do agree with what Mr. Mallaradhya says that so far as English is concerned, we cannot displace that language still; it will take time, probably 50 years. There are other languages like Hindi which are good for expression of ideas and any of these languages may be adopted as the medium of instruction, but that will take some time.

With the remarks, I do not know whether to compliment Mr. Gorwala or denounce him for what he has said in his Report, but any how let us take the best of whatever he has suggested.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳೇ, ನಮ್ಮ ವೃಂದ ಈ ದಿನ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಆಡಳಿತದ ಕೆಲವು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಸಲಹೆಗಳು ಎನ್ನುವುದರಮೇಲೆ ಈಗ ಎರಡು ದಿವಸಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಯಾರಿಂದ ಉದ್ಭವವಾಯಿತು, ಯಾರಿಗಾಗಿ ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ, ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಿಂದ ಮೈಸೂರು ಜನತೆಗೆ ಆಗತಕ್ಕ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಅನಾನುಕೂಲಗಳೇನು, ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಮಾನ-ಮರಾದೆಗಳು, ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಗೌರವ ಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠೆಗಳು ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಕಾಪಾಡಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿವೆ ಎಂಬ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಈ ಹೊತ್ತು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಯಾಗುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಮನನೋಯಿಸತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಬೇರದ ಮನ್ನುಂಟು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ರಿಪೋರ್ಟನ್ನು ನಾವು ಇಂದು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆನುಬಹುದು. ಈಗ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿರುವವರ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಜ್ಞಾಪಕ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಹೆದರಿಕೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ಅವರ ಹೆಸರು A.D. ಗೋರವಾಲ ಎಂದಿದ್ದರೂ ಅವರು 'ಗೋರವಾಲ' ದಂತದ್ದು ಘೋರ ಎಂದರೆ ಭಯಂಕರವೆಂದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಭಯಂಕರವಾದ ಒಂದು ರಿಪೋರ್ಟನ್ನು ನಾವು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಅಂಶವನ್ನೂ ನಾವು ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೂ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ, ಜನತೆಗೂ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ, ಆಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೂ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ, ಕೊನೆಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಕಡೆ ಮತ್ತು ಆ ಕಡೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡುವವರಿಗೂ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲವೆನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು

ಮನನೋಯಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿರುವವರು, ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಈ ಕಡೆಯವರು ಮತ್ತು ಆಕಡೆಯವರು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಗೋರವಾಲರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ, ಇದು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರ ಮತ್ತು ಬೇರ್ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯವರ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಖಡಾಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ, ಖಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬಲ್ಲೆ.

ಏತಕ್ಕೊಂದರೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಡಿ. ಗೋರವಾಲ ಅವರ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟನ್ನು ಪ್ರೊಡ್ಯೂಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರ ಹಿಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಕೈವಾದ ಈ ಅನರ್ಥ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳದು ಇನ್ನಾರದೂ ಅಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಯಾವ ಭಯವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಬೇರ್ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯವರ ಕೈವಾದವೂ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೂ ರೋಷವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಮೂಲಕ ಬಿನ್ನಪ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಂದೇಹಪೂರ್ವಕವಾದ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದರೆ ನನಗೆ ಅದು ಅತ್ಯರೋಪವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಭಯಂಕರವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಎರಡು ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಈ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಧಾರ ಮಾಡಿದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದು ಸುಳ್ಳು ಅವರು ಯಾರೂ ಇದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ಈಗೀಗ ಒಂದು ದಾರಿಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಈ ಗೋರವಾಲ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಬರೆಯ ಒಂದು ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಮತ್ತೇನೂ ಅದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೆರಡು ವಾಕ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಆ ರೀತಿ ಬರೆದುಬಿಟ್ಟು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದಾಸ್ಪದವಾದ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋರವಾಲ ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಲ್ಲ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ಬರೆದು ಸಾಯಂಕಾಲ 7 ಘಂಟೆ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ವರದಿಗೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋರವಾಲ ಅವರ ಸಹಿಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆಗ ಅವರು ಯಾವ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ. ನನ್ನ ಕೆಲವು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಈ ಗೋರವಾಲ ಅವರ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ, ಯಾರೂ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಿಸಬೇಡಿ, ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಅದೇ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ವ್ಯರ್ಥವಾಗಿ ಉಪಯೋಗ ಮಾಡುವಂಥಾದ್ದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ ಈ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಕಾಮದಹನ ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಕೀರ್ತಿ, ಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠೆ, ಪಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು, ಮತ್ತು ಬಹಳ ಕ್ಲೇಮವಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಏನೂ ತಪ್ಪಾಗಲಾರದು ಎಂದು ತಮ್ಮ ಮೂಲಕ ಬಿನ್ನಪ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ರಾಜಗೋಪಾಲ್ ಅವರ ವರದಿ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ, ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಸ್. ರಾಘವೇಂದ್ರರಾವ್ ಅವರ ವರದಿ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ? ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆ ವರದಿಗಳಲ್ಲ ಎಂಥೆಂಥ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಯಾವ ಪ್ಲಾನ್ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋದರೆ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಿಸಿದಷ್ಟು ಫಲ ದೊರಕುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಶದವಾಗಿ ಆ ವರದಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂತಹ ವರದಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ಇದು ಜನತೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅದರಿಂದ ಜನತೆಗೆ ಅಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿ ದೊರಕಬೇಕಾದಂಥ ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು



(ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ)

ಕಲ್ಸಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಜನತೆ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಈ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಏನು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ? ಈ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರು 9-10 ಗ್ರಹಗಳು ಮತ್ತು 6 ಉಪಗ್ರಹಗಳ ಮುಂಚೆ ನಿಂತುಕೊಂಡು ಪೆಚ್ಚುಮುಖವಿಟ್ಟು ಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಮುಂದೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೇನಿತ್ತು? ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ಮನುಷ್ಯ ನಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ದುರುದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ರಾಜಕೀಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಾನಮಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಈ ಈ ಭಯಂಕರವಾದ ವಿಧಾನ ಸೌಧದ ಒಂದು ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ದೇಶದ ಮುಂದೆ ತಂದು, ಅವನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತಂದಿರುವುದು ರಾಜಕೀಯವನ್ನೇ ಆಶೋಲ ಕಶೋಲವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇವರಿಬ್ಬರನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ನ್ಯಾಯಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇಂತಹ ವರದಿಯಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಏತಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೇ ವರದಿಯ ಆದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ: "During the time I have been in Mysore the Governmental and administrative atmosphere has seemed to be vitiated by what has seemed to be Vidhana Soudha Scandal." ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದುಗಾದೆ ಇದೆ. "ಉಂಡೆಲೆ ಎತ್ತೋಗುಂಡ ಎಂದರೆ ಉಟ ಮಾಡಿದವರೆಷ್ಟು ಜನ" ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ವಿಧಾನಸೌಧದ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಲೋಪದೋಷಗಳೇನೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹುಡುಕುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಿಧಾನ ಸೌಧದ ಎಣ್ಣೆ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಟೀಕೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಗೋರ್ವಾಲ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದರೇ ಅಥವಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲ ಕುಂದುಂಟು, ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲ ಏನೇನು ಲೋಪದೋಷಗಳಿವೆ, ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಏನೇನು ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಅಳವಡಿಸಬೇಕು ಇವೆಲ್ಲಕ್ಕೂ ಸಲಹೆ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರೇ? ಇವೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ವಿಧಾನಸೌಧ ಸ್ಕಾಂಟಲ್ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇವರನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನೇಮಿಸಿತೇ? ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ವಿಧಾನ ಸೌಧದ ಎಣ್ಣೆ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್‌ಗಳು ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಅವು ಸರಿಯೇ ತಪ್ಪೇ ಎಂದು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇವರ ವರದಿ ಖಂಡಿತ ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕ. ಯಾರು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣರು ಎಂದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ. ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋರ್ವಾಲ ಅವರು ಅಧಿಕ ಪ್ರಸಂಗತನಕ್ಕೆ ಕೈಹಾಕಿದುದರಿಂದಲೇ ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ತಾವು ಪೆಚ್ಚು ಮೋರೆ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಟೀಕೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಗುರಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದೇನು ತಪ್ಪಾಗಲಾರದು. ವಿಧಾನ ಸೌಧ ಕಟ್ಟುವ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಏನಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಅನೇಕರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ವಿಧಾನ ಸೌಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಸ್ಥಳವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಕಟ್ಟಡವನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮೊನ್ನೆತಾನೇ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಷನ್ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟೇರಿಯಟ್‌ನೇ ಬೇರೆ ಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕೆಂದೂ ಸಹ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ

ಒಂದೊಂದು ಅಂಗವೂ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಬೆಳೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ, ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳ ಆಶೋತ್ತರಗಳನ್ನು ಈಡೇರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಸಕಲ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ಅಂಥವರನ್ನು ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಇಟ್ಟು ವಿಧಾನ ಸೌಧದಂತಹ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಟ್ಟಡ ಕಟ್ಟಿದರೆ ಸಾಕು ಐ.ಸಿ.ಎಸ್., ಐ.ಪಿ.ಎಸ್. ಅಫೀಸರುಗಳೇನು ಅಷ್ಟು ಬೃಹಸ್ಪತಿಗಳೇ ಅವರಿಗೇನು ಬಾಲ್ ಇದೆಯೇ, ಕೊಂಬು ಇದೆಯೇ? ಅವರೂ ಎಲ್ಲರ ಹಾಗೆ ಮನುಷ್ಯರೇ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಪುಲ್ಕಾರ್ಡಿಯವರು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದಾಗಿದ್ದು ಚೀಫ್ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯವರ ಆಡಳಿತ ಅಷ್ಟು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಡಳಿತ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ದಕ್ಷತೆಯಿಂದ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿತ್ತು, ಸರ್ಕಾರೀ ನೌಕರರು ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು, ಜನರಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿನ ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು ಎಂಬುದು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅದು ಈಗಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದವರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ? 60-70 ವರ್ಷಗಳಕಾಲ ಹೋರಾಟಮಾಡಿ ಇಂಗ್ಲಿಷರನ್ನು ಈ ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಓಡಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಯಾದಮೇಲೆ, ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ತತ್ತ್ವಕ್ಕನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಡಳಿತ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಖಕ್ಕೆ ನೀವೇ ಮುಸಿಬಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರೆಂದು ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್‌ಗೆ ನೀವೇ ಅವಮಾನ ಪಡಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಈ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಏತಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್‌ವರ್ಕ್ಸ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ರಿ-ಆರ್ಗನೈಜೇಷನ್ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ಆಗಲೂ ಯಾವುದನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಖಕ್ಕೆ ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲೂ ಮಂಗಳಾರತಿ ಮಾಡಿದಿರಿ. ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಈ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಇದು ಸರಿಯೇ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ನಿಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ಭಯಂಕರವಾದವರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲ ಹೋದರೂ ಕೂಡ, ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳು ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ತಯಾರಾಗಿದೆ ಮತ್ತು ವಿಧಾನ ಸೌಧದ ಸ್ಕಾಂಟಲ್‌ನ ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ಒಡಕವಾಗಿವೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಮತ್ತಾವ ವಿಚಾರವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಯಾರು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ವಿಧಾನ ಸೌಧದ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂಚೆ ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಇಡಬೇಕು. ಇನ್ನು ಕೆಲವು ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಕಾಗದ ಪತ್ರಗಳು ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಈ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

In the absence of a pertinent document in the absence of evidence and in the absence of so many factors, may I put the question to this same Government, how my friend Bhayankarawala came to the conclusion that there is a scandal about Vidhana Soudha, except by the report of Dev's Committee, except from the reports of the people talking in the streets? Sri Channabasappa was saying 'You are relying upon some street talks'. ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಮೂರುಬಾರಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಂದವರು ಸಮಾಧಾನದಿಂದ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಶಾಂತಚಿತ್ತರಾಗಬೇಕು. ಯಾರು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಗ್ರಹಣೆ ಮಾಡಿ



SRI A. D. GORWALA

ಕೊಂಡು ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಕಡೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇ ಇರುವ ಕಡೆ ಮಹಾತ್ಮಾಗಾಂಧಿಯವರ ತತ್ವವನ್ನು ಪಾಲನೆಮಾಡಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಮಹಾತ್ಮಾಗಾಂಧಿಯವರೇ ಒಂದು ಸಾರಿ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ನೆಲೆ ಉಪವಾಸಮಾಡಿದ್ದು ತಪ್ಪು ಎಂದು ಕಂಡು ಬಂದಾಗ ಅವರ ಆ ಉಪವಾಸವನ್ನೇ ಬ್ರೇಕ್ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅಗುವಾಗ್ಗೆ ನಾವೇನು ಬ್ರಹ್ಮನಿಗಿಲ್ಲ. ನೀವು ಮನುಷ್ಯರೇ ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಸಾವಧಾನದಿಂದಿರಬೇಕು. ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಕೆ. ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯನವರ ದೂರ ದೃಷ್ಟಿ ಏನಿತ್ತು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಪಾಠಕ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಇರುವ ಜನ ನಾವು; ಇಂದು ಉಪಕಾರಮಾಡಿದಂತೆ ವಾಸ್ತವ ನೆನೆಯಬೇಕು. “ಉಪ್ಪಿಟ್ಟವರನ್ನು ಮುಪ್ಪಿನವರೆಗೂ ನೆನೆಯಬೇಕು” ಎಂಬ ಗಾಂಧಿಯಂತೆ ಪಾಠಕ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆಯೇ!

5-30 P.M.

ಈ ದಿವಸ ವಿಶಾಲ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಂದಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದಲ್ಲರತ್ತ ಕೆಲವರು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು, ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದ್ದ ಮತ್ತೆ ಕೆಲವರು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಜೀವಾವಧಿಯಲ್ಲೇ ಆಗುವಂತಿಲ್ಲ, ಹಾಗೊಂದುವೇಳೆ ಅದು ಆಗುವುದಾದರೆ ಅದು ನಮ್ಮ ಹೇಗಿ ಗೋರಿ ಮೇಲೆ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಯಾಗಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದವರಲ್ಲ ಈಚೆಗೆ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಯಾದಮೇಲೆ ಅವರು ಹೇಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಆ ಮೋರೆಯನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತರೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಕುಳಿತೂ ಅವರಿಗೇಕೆ ನಾಚಿಕೆಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ! ಹೀಗೆ ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಮಾನ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಅಂಟಿಕೊಂಡುಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಅಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಕೋಪಾರೂಢರಾಗಿ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಗೆ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಅಡಚಣೆಗಳನ್ನೊಡ್ಡಿದ್ದವರೇ ಈಗ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಯಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಂದು ಸಹೋದರ ಭಾವದಿಂದ ಹೊಂದಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಬೇಕೆಂದ ಈಗ ಏನೇನೋ ಭಾಷಣಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಬದರಾಯಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅವರ ಕೈರಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಬೇರೆ ಯಾರೋ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಹಾಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಕೈರಾಗದಿದ್ದ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಬೇರೆಯವರು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇವರು ಅವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೊಟ್ಟೆಉರಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಾರದು. ದೇವೇಂದ್ರನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ರಂಥ ಉರುತಿಯವರು ನಾಟ್ಯಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನಾವು ಹೊಟ್ಟೆಕಿಚ್ಚು ಪಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ನವರ ಧಿಮೆಟರನಲ್ಲ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಹುಡುಗರಿಗೆ ಸೀರೆ ಉಡಿಸಿ ನಾಟ್ಯಮಾಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ನೀವು ಆ ಆದಿವರ ಅದು ದೇವೇಂದ್ರನ ಸಭೆಯೆಂದು ಕರೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆವೋ! ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಬಿ. ಮುರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು ತಾವು ಯಾರೂ ವಸೂಲ್ಯಾಡದಿದ್ದು 80 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಈ ಸಾರ್ತಿ ವಸೂಲ್ಯಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆಂದು ಹೇಗೆ ಭುಜತಟ್ಟಿ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಂಡರು! ನಾನೇ ಈ ರೋಡ್ ಟ್ರಾಕ್ ಸ್ಟೋರ್ ಟನ್ನು ನ್ಯಾಷನಲೈಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದನೆಂದೇಕೆ ಅವರು ಭುಜತಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡರು! ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು ಅವರುಮಾಡಿದಂಥ ಕೆಲಸಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕೆಮ್ಮೆಯನ್ನು ಪುಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಭುಜವನ್ನು ತಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡರೋ ಹಾಗೇ ಅವರ

ತತ್ವಗಳಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಭುಜತಟ್ಟಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅವರೇಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡಬಾರದು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಮುರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟನ್ನು ನಾನೇ ಬರೆಸಿದವನೆಂದು ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಚಾರ ಬೇರೆ ಎಂದಿದೆ!

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಹೌದು, ಹೌದು, ನೀವು ವತ್ಸು ಅಚೀಫ್ ಕೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ ಇಬ್ಬರೂ ಸೇರಿ ಈ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಬರೆಸಿದ್ದೀರೆಯೆಂದು ನಾನು ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಮುರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ನಿಮಗೆ ಪ್ರಮಾಣವೆಂದರೆನು ಎನ್ನುವುದರ ಅರ್ಥ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಗೊತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ತಾನೆ? ನಾನು ಕೇವಲ ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ಸಾರ್ತಿ ರೆಸಿಡೆನ್ಸಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ವಯ ನೋಡಿದ್ದು. ನನಗೆ ಅವರಿಯಾರು, ಏನು ಎತ್ತ ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಮಾಚಾರಗಳೊಂದೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

ಧೀರನ್ ಅವರು.—ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಪ್ರವೇಶಿಸಿದರೆ ವ್ಯಥಾಕಾಲವಿಳಂಬಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟುಹಾಕುತ್ತದೆ. ನೀವು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಏನು ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಆಗ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ನಿಮಗೂ ನಮಗೂ ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಏಕೆ ಕೋಪ ಬರುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ? ಶ್ರೀ ಮುರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರಿಗೇಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಕೋಪಬರಬೇಕೋ ನನಗೆ ಅದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಅವರೇ ಬರೆಸಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ, ಅವರ ಬರೆಸಿದ್ದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೇಕೆ ಕೋಪ ಬರಬೇಕು! ಆದರೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಈ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿರತಕ್ಕ ವ.ಸಿ ಅವರ ಮುಖಕ್ಕೆ ತಗುಲದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಆಗ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಕೈವಾಡ ಎಲ್ಲವೆಂದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಯಾರೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೊದಲೇ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮುರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು ಈ ವರದಿಯ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದ ಪಂಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನೂ ಓದದೆ ಇದ್ದಿದ್ದರಿಂದಲೇ ಅವರು ದುಡುಕಿ ಇದರ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ರೈನನ್ನೂ ದಿನ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಗೆ ಬಹಿರಂಗ ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆ ಹೊರಡಿಸಿದರು! ನಿಮ್ಮ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಈ ವರದಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇದ್ದುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿಯೇ ನೀವು ಇದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಲು ಒಪ್ಪಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಇದೇನೂ ಅವರ ಒಂದು ಸ್ವಯಂ ಪ್ರಭೆಯಿಂದ ತಯಾರಿಸಿದಂಥ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಇವರು ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಈ ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಅಡ್ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಷನ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಶ್ರೀ ರಾಜಗೋಪಾಲರವರೂ ಮತ್ತೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಸ್. ರಾಘವೇಂದ್ರರಾವ್ ಅವರೂ, ಸರ್ ಅಲ್ಪಯ್ಯನ್ ಬ್ಯಾನರ್ಜಿ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿಯವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿದ್ದ ವರದಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಅರಿವಿಕೊಂಡು ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಕಥೆಮಾಡಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಪೋಷಿಸಿ ಬರೆಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ನಿಂದನೆಗೆ ಗುರಿಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಅತುರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರೂ ಸಹ ಈ ಅವಾಧನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ತುತ್ತಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅರಿಯದೆ ಹೋದದ್ದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ರಾಜಕೀಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಥ ದೂರದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ಕೋಪಾವೇಶದ ಭರದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ದಿವಸ ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಕೈನಿಕ್ಕಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು, “ತಾನೊಂದು ಬಗ್ಗಿದರೆ ದೈವವೊಂದು ಬಗ್ಗುತ್ತೆಂದು ಹಾಗೆ ಅವರು “ಭಜಗೋವಿಂದಂ” ಹೇಳುತ್ತ ಕುಳಿತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಹೊತ್ತಿನೋ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮುರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು ರಾಜಕೀಯದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಾಳೆ ಅವರು ಈ ರಾಜಕೀಯವನ್ನೇ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಒಡುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ನವ ಗೇನೂ ಅಂಥ ಹೊಟ್ಟೆ ಉರಿಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದಾಗ್ಯೂ ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಹಿತ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಅಷ್ಟೇನೇ. ಆದರೆ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ)

ನಾನು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದಿಷ್ಟೆ. ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಅವರು ತಯಾರಿಸುವಾಗ ಈ ವಿಧಾನಸೌಧದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ಗಾಗರೇ ಯಾರು ಯಾರು ಏನೇನು ವರದಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಯಾರು ಯಾರು ಏನೇನು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರು ಯಾರು ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಗಳು ಏನೇನು ವಿಚಾರ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಂಥ ವಿದ್ಯಾಸಂಪನ್ನರೂ, ವಿವೇಕ ಸಂಪನ್ನರೂ ಆದವರು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಣೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಏಕಾ ಏಕಿ ಹೀಗೊಂದು ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದು ಅವರ ಘನತೆಗಾರವಗಳಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ್ದಲ್ಲ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕವರು ನನಗೆ ಈ ವಿಧಾನ ಸೌಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೂಂ ನರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ, ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಬೆಳಕಿಲ್ಲ, ಗಾಳಿಯಿಲ್ಲ, ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಲ್ಲಾ! ಆದರೆ ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ತಂದೆ ತಾಯಿಗಳ ಹೊಟ್ಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹುಟ್ಟಿದರಲ್ಲಾ ಆ ದಿವಸ ಇವರು ಹುಟ್ಟಿದ ಆ ಮನೆಯು ಹೇಗಿತ್ತೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಇವರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೋ! ಅವರೆಲ್ಲಾ ಅಂಥ ಮನೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹುಟ್ಟಿ ಬೆಳೆದರೆ ಏ ವಿಚಾರ ಯಾರಿಗೆ ತಾನೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ! ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ಏನೋ ಎರಡು ದಿವಸದ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿರುವಾಗ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾಗದಪತ್ರಗಳ ವಿರೇವಾರಿಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೇನೇ ನಮಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರೈವೆಸಿಯಲ್ಲ, ಸೀಕ್ರೆಸಿಯಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಲ್ಲಾ! ಇದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲ ಯಾರ ಪ್ರಭಾವ ಬಿದ್ದು ಇವರು ಹೀಗಾದರೆಂದರೆ— ಆ ಐ. ಸಿ. ಎಸ್. ಆಫೀಸರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹರಿದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಕಲುಷಿತ ವಾತಾವರಣದ ಪ್ರಭಾವಕ್ಕೆ ತುತ್ತಾಗಿ ಇವರು ಈದಿವಸ ತಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಬಂದಂತೆ ಏನೋ ಎಂದು ಕಥೆಯನ್ನು ಬರೆದು ತಾವೂ ಸಹ ಆ ರಾಮಾಯಣವನ್ನು ಬರೆದು ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧಿ ಹೊಂದಿದ ವಾಲ್ಮೀಕಿಯಂತೆ ಮತ್ತು ಆ ಭಾರತವನ್ನು ಬರೆದು ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧಿ ಪಡೆದ ಕುಮಾರವ್ಯಾಸನಂತೆ, ಆ ಗೋರಾಲ್ಪರವರೂ, ಇವರೂ ಈ ಒಂದು ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಬರೆದು ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧಿ ಹೊಂದಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದಂತೆ ಭಾಸವಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಆ ಕಾಮದಹನ ಮುಗಿದುಹೋಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಆ ಕಾಮದಹನಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗ ಇದನ್ನೇ ದಹನಮಾಡಿಬಿಡಬಹುದಿತ್ತು. ಇವರು ಕೇವಲ ಈ ವಿಧಾನ ಸೌಧದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಅಪಸ್ವರ ನುಡಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಟಾಗ ಈ ಕಟ್ಟಡದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾರು ಯಾರು ಏನೇನು ಮೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಯಾರು ಯಾರು ಯಾರು ಏನೇನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಆ ಸರ್ಟಿಫಿಕೇಟ್ ರಾಧಾಕೃಷ್ಣರವರು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ರಾಜ್ಯಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಶ್ರೀ ಚಕ್ರವರ್ತಿ ರಾಜಗೋಪಾಲಾಚಾರಿಯವರೇನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಹೀಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಆ ಹೆಸರುವಾಸಿಗಳಿಸಿದಂಥ ಜಡ್ಡಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದವರೇನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದೊಂದನ್ನೂ ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡದೆ ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿದ್ದು ಶುದ್ಧಾಂಗವಾದ ತಪ್ಪು. ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಕೊಂಗೆಚೇಷ್ಟೆಮಾಡಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆ ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋರಾಲ್ಪರವರಿಗಿದ್ದೇವರು ಇಂಥ ಬುದ್ಧಿಯನ್ನೇಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟನೋ? ದೇವರು ಇವರಿಗೇಕೆ ಬಳಿಯ ಬುದ್ಧಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತೆಂದು ಆಲೋಚನೆಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾಗ ಇದಕ್ಕೆಯಾರೋ ಹಿಂದುಗಡೆ ಇದ್ದು ತಮ್ಮ ಕೈವಾಡಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದು ತನಗೇನೋ ವಿಡಿತವಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಆ ಗೋರಾಲ್ಪರವರು ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರನ್ನು ವರದಿ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಇರ

ಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಇವರೇನೋ ಒಂದು ಆ ಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಅವರಿಗೊಂದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಈಗ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಪರ್ಯವಸಾನಗೊಂಡಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಅವರಿಗೆ ‘ಏನೋ ಕಳೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಅದೇನೋ ಹುಡುಕಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಡ’ ಎನ್ನುವಂತಾಗಿ, ಈತನನ್ನು ನಾವೇಕೆ ಈ ಬಡುಕಿಗಾಗಿ ಕರೆಸಿದವೋ ಎಂದು ಶ್ರೀ ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು ಕೈ ಕೈಹಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮೈಸೂರ ರಾಜ್ಯವನ್ನೇ ಒಟ್ಟುಹೊರಗಡೆಹೋಗಿ ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಬರಿಸಲು ಇಂಥ ಜಾಣನನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಬರಲು ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯವೇನು ಜಾಣರಿಲ್ಲದಷ್ಟು ಜಾಣೆಯ ದಿವಾಳಿ ಹೊಂದಿತ್ತೇ! ಅದೇನಾದರೂ ಅಂಥ ಕಟ್ಟಡದ್ದರ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ನೀಡಲು ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರೂ ಅಂಥ ಜಾಣರೇ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲವೋ! ಹೀಗೆ ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ದುರುದ್ದೇಶ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಇಷ್ಟೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರ ಪ್ರತಿಫಲವನ್ನು ಅವರು ಮುಂದೆ ಅನುಭವಿಸಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ತಾನೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು— ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಎಲ್ಲ ಭಾಗಗಳ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಡಳಿತ ಉತ್ತಮಗೊಳ್ಳಲು ನೂರಾರು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಆ ಮಾತು ಸತ್ಯವಾದದ್ದು. ಅಂಥ ಆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಲಹೆಗಳೊಂದಕ್ಕೂ ಗಮನಕೊಡದೆ ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷದಿಂದಲೂ ನಮ್ಮನೆ ಕುಳಿತಿದ್ದು ಈಗ ಈ ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಹಾ ಬೃಹಸ್ಪತಿಯನ್ನು ಕರೆತಂದು ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಬರಿಸಲು ನಿಮಗೆ ಮನಸ್ಸಾದರೂ ಹೇಗೆ ಒಡಂಬಡುತ್ತೀ? ಈ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಬರಿಸಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೇನೂ ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಏನೇನೂ ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೋ? ಆ ಗೋರಾಲ್ಪರಿಗೆ ತಾವು ಉಚ್ಚಕ್ಕೂ ಹಾಕಲಿಲ್ಲವೋ! ಅವರೇ ಏನಾದರೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಖರ್ಚಿನಿಂದಲೇ ಇಲ್ಲದ್ದು ಈ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಮಾಡಿದರೇನು! ಹೋಗಲಿ ಇವರನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕರೆಸಿದ್ದ ಕಾರಣ ಯಾವುದು! ಅದೇನು ಉತ್ತಮಗೊಳ್ಳಲು ಮತ್ತು ದೇಶಾಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ನೀಡಲು ಇವರನ್ನು ಕರೆಸಿದ್ದು ಹೇಗೆ ಆಗಿದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಇವರೇನು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ದೇಶಾಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಯ ಒಳ್ಳೆ ನೂಟಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ! ಅದಿವಾರವನ್ನು ಹೀಗೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಎಡಜನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಇಂಥಂಥ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಹೀಗೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಏನಾದರೂ ಖಚಿತವಾದ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೇನು! ಅಂಥ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಆಗ ನಾವೂ ಸಹ ಸಂತೋಷಪಡದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಬಹುದಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಥ ಯಾವ ನೂಟನೆಗಳನ್ನೂ ಬರೆದಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಬರವಣಿಗೆಯನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಬರೆದು ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ‘I must express my gratefulness in particular to Mr. P.V.R. Rao’ ಎಂದು ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಏಕೆ ಅದು! ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಅವರೇನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದಿತ್ತೆಂದರೆ—He ought to have expressed his gratitude to the Ministry in power—‘This Ministry is doing good work, this Ministry is working really to the good of the people’—ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಅವರಿಬ್ಬರೂ ಒಂದೇ ದರ್ಜೆಯವರಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ‘Birds of the same feather flock together’

ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವಂತೆ ಅವರಿಬ್ಬರೂ ತಮಗೆ ತಾವೇ ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೊಬ್ಬರು ಭುಜ ತಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಅದೇನೆಂಬುದೇ ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ ಇದು ಏನು ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತದೆ? ಗೋರ್‌ವಾಲಾ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ರಾತ್ರಿ ಏಳು ಘಂಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ರುಜು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ರಾತ್ರಿ ಏಳು ಘಂಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ರುಜು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು, ಪಿ. ಎ. ಆರ್‌ ರವರ ಹೆಸರು ಬದಲು ಗೋರ್‌ವಾಲ ಎಂದು ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಪಿ. ಎ. ಆರ್‌ರವರು ಗೋರ್‌ವಾಲರ ಹೆಸರು ಹಾಕಿ ಪ್ರಿಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಹಂಚಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೂ ಗೋರ್‌ವಾಲರನ್ನು ಬಯ್ಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಪಕ್ಷ ಬಯ್ಯುವುದು ಎಸಾಧರೂ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಅದು ಬೇರ್ಫ್ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯವರ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟು. ಬೇರ್ಫ್ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯವರು ಏನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದರೆ ಅವರ ವಜಾಯ್ತುವನ್ನು ಸೆಕೆಂಡ್ ಡಿವಿಷನ್, ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಡಿವಿಷನ್ ಕ್ಲಾರ್ಕುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಮೆಸ್ಸೇಜರ್‌ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಎಸ್ಪೆರಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ದೇಶದ ಹಣ, ದೇಶದ ಜನತೆಯನ್ನು ಎಸ್ಪೆರಮೆಂಟ್ ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಯಜ್ಞ ಕುಂದದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಪ್ಪುಸಾರಿ ಅವರು ಅದ್ವಿಮುಳುಗಿ ಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹತ್ತು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಮಾಡಿದಂಥ ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರ ಹೀಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣರಾಯರು, ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು ಅಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಹಳ ಚಾಕಚಕ್ಯತೆಯಿಂದ ಮಾಡಿದರು! ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರ ಮುಖಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಸಿ ಬೀಳಿದರು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ನಾನೇ ಹೇಳಿಸಿ ಬರೆಸಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ!

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಅಯ್ಯೋ ಪರಮಾತ್ಮ, ಅದನ್ನೇ ಹೇಳುವುದು. ಹೊಸ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಬಂದು ಇನ್ನೂ ಬಹಳ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ದಿನವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಂಟಿಗ್ರೇಷನ್ ಈಗ ತಾನೇ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಹೇಗೆ ಹೇಗೆ ವಿಭಜನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನೀತಿಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ದುಃಖವಿಲ್ಲ, ಹೊರಟುಬಿಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈಗ ತಾನೇ full-swingನಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರೆ, ಸ್ವಂಥವನಕ್ಕೋಟೆಯನ್ನು ಯಾರು ಪಾಂಡವರ ಕಡೆಯವರು ಒಡೆಯುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಗೋರ್‌ವಾಲರವರು ತಪ್ಪು ಹೆಜ್ಜೆ ತುಳಿಸಿಬಿಟ್ಟರು ಅಹಂಕಾರದ ಕತ್ತಲಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಲಡುವಾಗ ಗೋರ್‌ವಾಲರವರೆಂಬ ಕಣ್ಣು ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರುವ ಮನುಷ್ಯನನ್ನು ಕರೆದು ಬರೆಸಿದರು. ಬರೆಸಿಬಿಟ್ಟು ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರಿಗೆ ಕೈ ಕೊಟ್ಟುಬಿಟ್ಟರು: ಅವರ ಹತ್ತು ವರ್ಷದ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ವೇನಾಯಿತು? ಕ್ರಾಂತಿಯನ್ನು ಎಬ್ಬಿಸತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಅಲ್ಪೋಲಕರೋಲ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ನಟವರ ವಿಚಕ್ಷಣೆ ಏನಾಯಿತು!

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಅದು ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಾಕರ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಅಯ್ಯೋ ರಾಮ, ಅದನ್ನೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇಂಥ ಮೂರ್ಖ ಚತುಷ್ಪಯರು, ಗಾಂಪರೊಡೆಯರ ಶಿಷ್ಯರು, ಏಕೆ ಇಂಥ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟು ಬರೆಸಿಕೊಂಡರು ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯಥೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ.

SRI A. R. PANCHAGAVI (Gokak II).—I rise to a point of order. Can one member address another member as ಮುಖ್ಯಶಿಶ್ಯಮಣಿ, ಗಾಂಪರೊಡೆಯರ ಶಿಷ್ಯರು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಅವರ ಸ್ವಭಾವ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ನನ್ನ ಸ್ವಭಾವಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾರೂ ಶಹಭಾಷೆಗಿರಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ.

MR. CHAIRMAN.—I think it is better to use polite language.

SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The Report that is in my hand contains the most vulgar language. If those words are used I am not out of my bounds. ನಮ್ಮಿಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ಕಾಂಪಿಟಿಷನ್ ಇದೆ. ನನಗಿಂತ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ವಾದ ಕನ್ನಡ ಅವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಘನವಾದ, ಕಠಿಣವಾದ ಕನ್ನಡ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾನು ಇವರ ಹಾಗೆ ಎರ್. ಎರ್. ಬಿ. ಒದ್ದೆದೇನೆಯೇ! ನಾನು ಎರ್. ಎಸ್. ಪಾನುಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಷಣ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು; ಗ್ರಾಮರ್, ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಿಮಗೆ ಕಾಣಬಹುದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಬಿಡತವಾದ, ಘನವಾದ, ಕಟುವಾದ ಸತ್ಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟವಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ, ನಾನು ಏನು ಮಾಡಲಿ! ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಮೂರ್ಖ ಶಿಶ್ಯಮಣಿ, ಮೂರ್ಖಚತುಷ್ಪಯ, ಗಾಂಪರೊಡೆಯರ ಶಿಷ್ಯರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ, ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಎಲ್ಲದೆ! ಏನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಇನ್ನು ರಿಪೋರ್ಟನ್ನು ಡಿಸ್‌ಕಸ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ವಿಧಾನ ಸೌಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಾಗಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಾ! ವಿಧಾನ ಸೌಧದ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಡಿವಿಷನ್, ಸೆಕೆಂಡ್ ಡಿವಿಷನ್ ಕ್ಲಾರ್ಕುಗಳ ವಿಷಯ ಮಲ್ಟಾರಾಧ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮೊದಲೊಂದು ರೆಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟರುಗಳವರೆಗೆ, ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ ಮೊದಲೊಂದು ಚಪ್ಪಾಸಿ ದರಾಯತ್‌ವರೆಗೆ ಟಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ನಾವು ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲರತ್ತಕ್ಕವರು ಅಷ್ಟು ಲರ ಅನಾಗರಿಕರೇ, ಅಷ್ಟು ತೀರದಡ್ಡರೇ! ಇಷ್ಟು ನೈರಾ ನೀವು ಅನಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅವರ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟನ್ನು ಪ್ರಿಂಟ್‌ಮಾಡಿ, ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕಾಗದ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ವೇಸ್ಟ್‌ಮಾಡಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಭಯಾನಕ ಪ್ರಸಂಗವನ್ನೊಡ್ಡಿ, ಎಂದಿಗೂ ಆಗದೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಅಭಾಸ ಪ್ರಸಂಗವನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಮೇಲೆ ಒತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ತಮಗೆ ಮೂರ್ಖ ಚತುಷ್ಪಯ, ಈ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು . . . . .

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಯಾರು ಗಾಂಪರೊಡೆಯರ ಶಿಷ್ಯರು, ಗೋಪಾಲರಾಯರ ಶಿಷ್ಯರು ಎಂಬುದು ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ.

MR. CHAIRMAN.—You can continue on the Report.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಅದನ್ನೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ. ವಿಧಾನಸೌಧದ ವಿಚಾರ ಏನು ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಆ ಗೋರ್‌ವಾಲ ಸಾಹೇಬರ ಇಗ್ನೋರೆನ್ಸ್ ಏನು ಹೇಳೋಣ! ಅವರು ಐ. ಸಿ. ಎಸ್. ಅಫೀಸರು ಒಂದು ಕಥೆ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರನ್ನು ಆಗಿನ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಬ್ಯೂರೋಕ್ರಾಟಿಕ್ ಗವರ್ನಮೆಂಟಿದ್ದಾಗಿ, ಐ. ಸಿ. ಎಸ್. ಅಫೀಸರಾಗಿ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ. Divide and rule policy ಇದ್ದಂಥ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಐ. ಸಿ. ಎಸ್. ಅಫೀಸರ ಮಗ ನಿಗೋ ಮೊಮ್ಮಗನಿಗೋ ಕೆಲಸ ಕೊಟ್ಟು, ಐದು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಸಂಬಳಕೊಟ್ಟು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಮೇಲೆ, ಜನತೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ದಬ್ಬಾಳಿಕೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಐ. ಸಿ. ಎಸ್. ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಇವತ್ತಿನದಿವಸ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ)

ಈ ಐ. ಸಿ. ಎಸ್. ಹುದ್ದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಥ ಗುರುತರವಾದ, ಅಂಥ ಪ್ರಚೋದಕವಾದ ತಲೆ ಏನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಏತಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಐ. ಸಿ. ಎಸ್. ಆಫೀಸರಿಗೆ ರಾಜನ ಕಿರೀಟದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕೊಹಿನೂರು ವಜ್ರವನ್ನು, ಕಿರೀಟವನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟರೋ ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ದಿವಾನಗಿರಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಪೂರ್ಣಾಯ ನವರು ಐ. ಸಿ. ಎಸ್. ಎ! ಅವರು ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ! ಅವರದು Indian cooking ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ತೇ! ಸರ್. ಎಂ. ವಿಶ್ವೇಶ್ವರಯ್ಯನವರು ಐ. ಸಿ. ಎಸ್. ಅಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ! ಸರ್ ಮಿರ್ಜಾ ಇಸ್ಮೇಲರೂ ಐ. ಸಿ. ಎಸ್. ಅಲ್ಲ. ಅವರೂ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ! ನೀವೂ ಹತ್ತುವರ್ಷಗಳ ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನೀವು ಐ. ಸಿ. ಎಸ್. ಅಲ್ಲ. ಈ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟನ್ನು ಸರ್ವಧಾ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದರು: 99 ಪಾಯಿಂಟುಗಳೇ; ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ 44ನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು. ಈ 44 ಪಾಯಿಂಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ, ಈ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದೀರಾ! ಹೇಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರಿ! ಯಾವುದು ನಿಮಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟವಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೋ, ನಿಮಗೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಿತ್ತೋ, ಅದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ತಂದಿರಿ. ಯಾವುದು ಕನ್ ವೀನಿಯಂಟ್ ಆಗಿತ್ತೋ, ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರಿ. ಕನ್ ವೀನಿಯಂಟ್ ಆಗದೆ ಇರವ ಮಾತುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ನಿಮಗೆ ಅಪಕೀರ್ತಿ ತರುವಂಥ, ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಾನ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಸಿಯುವಂಥ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರಿ? ನಿಮಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಧೈರ್ಯವಿದೆ? ಏನು ಧೈರ್ಯವಿದೆಯೋ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಗೋರವಾರಾ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟನ್ನು ಎಂಥ ಬೆಳಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಮರ್ಶೆಮಾಡಿದರೂ, ಇದು ಸತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ದೂರವಾದುದು, ಪ್ರಾಮಾಣಿಕತೆಗೆ ದೂರವಾದುದು, ಧರ್ಮ, ನ್ಯಾಯ ಎಂದು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರೋ, ಎಲ್ಲಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ದೂರವಾದುದು. ಇದು ಒನ್ ಸೈಡೆಡ್ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್. ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಒಂದು ತರಹ ಅಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಬರೆದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್. ವಿಧಾನಸೌಧದ ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಡರ್ ತರಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇದನ್ನು ತಂದು ಒಬ್ಬರ ಮನಸ್ಸು ನೋಯಿಸಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಗೋರವಾಲಿಗೆ 60ವರ್ಷವಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ, ಬುದ್ಧಿ ಅರುಳು ಮರಳು ಆಗಿತ್ತು. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ರಾತ್ರಿ ಏಳುಘಂಟೆ ಯಲ್ಲಿ ರುಜು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಪಿ. ವಿ. ಆರ್. ರಾಯರು ಬರೆದುವಕ್ಕೆ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರೂ ಸಹ ರುಜು ಹಾಕಿದರು ಅಂದರೆ ತಪ್ಪಾಗಲಾರದು.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—How long do you want to speak?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I want another halfanhour. I have got another Maha Bharata about my friend Mr. Mariappa. ಯಾವ ವಿಧಾನಸೌಧದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಂತು ಕೊಂಡು ಈ ವರದಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆಯೋ ಆ ವಿಧಾನ ಸೌಧವನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿದಂಥ ಪುಣ್ಯಾತ್ಮನ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಟ್ಟೆಕಿಚ್ಚು ಪಡಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಮುಂದಿನ ಜನಾಂಗ ಇಂಥ ಭವ್ಯ ಕಟ್ಟಡವನ್ನು ಯಾರು ಕಟ್ಟಿದರೋ, ಯಾವ ಪುಣ್ಯಾತ್ಮರು ಕಟ್ಟಿದರೋ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇಂದು ಟೀಕೆಮಾಡಿದುದನ್ನು ಯಾರೂ ಕೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಬೀದಿ

ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆನೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವಾಗ ಅದರ ಹಿಂದೆ ಒಂದು ಶುನಕವಾದದ್ದು ಬೊಗಳಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಆನೆಗೆ ಏನೂ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವೇತು ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ, ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಮಾಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಮಾನ, ಗೌರವ, ಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ತರುತ್ತಿ ದ್ದೀರೋ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನತಿ ದೂರದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದೇ, ಶ್ರೀಘ್ರವಾಗಿಯೇ ಅದರ ಫಲವನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸಬಹುದು ತ್ರೀರಿ. ಅದು ಜನತೆಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ವಾಗಿ ಈ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನು ತರಬಾರದಾ ಗಿತ್ತು. ಈ ವಿಧಾನ ಸೌಧವನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿದಂಥ ಪುಣ್ಯಾತ್ಮನಿಗೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗಲಿ ಎಂದು ದೇವರನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಈ ವಿಧಾನ ಸೌಧದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಗಳು show boys 'ನಕಲಿಶ್ಯಾಮ' ಇದ್ದ ಹಾಗೆ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ, ಮಹಾ ರಾಜರ ಆಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ತನಾ-ರಾಮಕೃಷ್ಣನಾದವನ್ನು ಅವರ ಮನಸ್ಸು jaded ಆದಾಗ ಅವರನ್ನು ಹರ್ಷ ಗೊಳಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದನು, ಅದೇರೀತಿ ಇವರುಗಳೂ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಂತಾಗಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಗಳು ಯಾರು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ದಕ್ಷತೆಯಿಂದ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡು ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ನೋಡಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಮೋಕ್ಷಣೆ ಕೊಡು ವಾಗ ಅವರ ಪೂರ್ವೇಕಾಂಕ್ಷೆಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ, ಕೆಲಸ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅವರಿಂದ ಅನೇಕ ವರದಿಗಳನ್ನು ಬರೆಸಿ ದ್ದೀರಿ, ಅವರಿಂದ ಅನೇಕ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯಗತ ಮಾಡಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇಂಥವರ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ನಾವು ವಿಧಾನಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ, ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಟೀಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದವು ನಿಜ. ಆದರೆ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಏತಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಟೀಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದೆವು? ಇನ್ನೂ ಅತಿ ಶ್ರೀಘ್ರವಾಗಿ ಅದಷ್ಟು ಶ್ರೀಘ್ರವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಲಿ ಎನ್ನುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ ಗಳನ್ನು ಅವಹೇಳನಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಟೀಕೆಮಾಡ ಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಉತ್ಸಾಹವೇ ನಿವೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬಾರದು. ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮಲ್ಟಾರಾಧರು ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ, ಈ ವರದಿ humiliating ಆಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಬರೆ ದಂಥ ಬೃಹಸ್ಪತಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಗಳು ಅಂದರ್ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಗಳು ಇವರೆಲ್ಲರನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ show boys ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದರ ಅರ್ಥವಾದರೂ ಏನು? ಇಂಥ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಬಹುದೇ? ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡ ಲದ ಮೇಲೆ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿನ ಕಡುಕು ಇದರಿಂದಾಗು ತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

"Any person accustomed to Secretariats cannot be pleasantly surprised on visiting the Mysore Secretariat. The building itself, extravagant in conception and expensive in upkeep, with its strange medley of ostentation and inconvenience, its noise, its echoing rooms, its large verandahs, its absence of privacy, is not particularly conducive to sustained and concentrated work. A cross between a palace and an office, it fulfils satisfactorily the purposes of neither. For good work to be

forthcoming in such surroundings greater effort than ordinary is essential."

ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಯಾವ ಕೆಲಸನಾದ್ದರಿಂದಲೇ ಇವರು ಯಾವ ದಿಗ್ಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ? ಶ್ರೀ ಚನ್ನ ಬಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಒಬ್ಬ ಅನಿಸ್ಪೆಷಲ್ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರನ್ನು ಎಕ್ಸಕೂಟಿವ್ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್ ಆಗಿ ವಾಪಸ್‌ಪಡಿಸಿದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ academic qualification ಇದೆ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅನುಭವವಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಅವರ ಚರಿತ್ರೆ ಏನು ಲಂಚಗುಡ್ಡವತ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ವಿಮರ್ಶಿಸಿದರೆ ಈತನಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತಮವಲ್ಲ, push ಇಲ್ಲ, ಎಂದು ಆತನನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿದು ಹಾಕಿ ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಮೋಷಣೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಐ.ಸಿ.ಎಸ್. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಾದವರು ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರಿಗೇ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಯಾವಾಗ ಒದಿಸಿರು? ಈ ಬಹುತರಗತಿಗಳು ಕೆಲಸ ಮತ್ತು ಶಿಲ್ಪವಿನ್ಯಯವು ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತರು ಎಂದು ಯಾರು ಹೇಳಿದರು? ಇವರು ಈ ವಿಭಾನ ಸ್ಥಾನದ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಏನನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದೋ ಅದಲ್ಲ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಗಳಾದ ಭರತರಾವನ ರಾತ್ರಿಹಗಲು ಕುತುಹಲವು ಉಳಿತಾಯವೆ ಬಡ್ತಿ ಟ್ಟನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸಿದರು. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕೊಠಡಿಯೊಳಗೆ ದಪ್ಪಗಳೇನಾದರೂ ಒಡಾಡಿದುವೇ; ನಿಮ್ಮ ಬುದ್ಧಿ ಚುರುಕಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ; ನಿಮ್ಮ ಬಿಡ್ಡಿ ಮಂತ್ರಾಂಗೀ; ನಿಮ್ಮ ಬುದ್ಧಿ ಮಾವಿನ ಹೂವನ್ನು ತರುತ್ತದೆ ಕೈ ಮಾರ್ಕಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿತ್ತೇ! ಅಂದಮೇಲೆ ಇಂಥ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಬಾರದೆ ಇರುವಂಥ ಅಸ್ತಮಾಶಯವಾದ ಪದಗಳನ್ನು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

ಸಲಹೆ ಮತ್ತು ಪಾಯಿಂಟುಗಳನ್ನು experiment ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. In the light of the discussions ದುಮ್ಮಿಷ್ಟಿಯೇ ಆತಮಾಡಿ.

"Whatever duties are entrusted to an official he is supposed to perform with necessary zeal. Special pay can be no inducement to such zeal".

ಐ.ಸಿ.ಎಸ್. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು, ಬೂ ರೋ ಕ್ಯಾಟರ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರವಿಧಾನ. ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದೇ ಇತರರಲ್ಲಿ ಐದು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಸಂಬಳಗಳನ್ನು ತೆರಲು ದುಡ್ಡನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಬೀಫ್ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಗಳು 3,250 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಷ್ಟೇ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಇತರ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು 1,500 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು 450, 600 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಯಾವ ದೇಶ ಬೇರೆ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯಾದರೂ ಇರುತ್ತದೆಂದೋ, ಯಾವ ದೇಶ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಶತಮಾನದಿಂದ ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದೇ ಇತರರಲ್ಲಿ ಇತ್ತೋ, ಅಂಥ ದೇಶ ಕಷ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಭಾರತೀಯರು, ಭಾರತೀಯರು ಮಕ್ಕಳು, ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನೊಬ್ಬ ಎಂದು, ಐ.ಸಿ.ಎಸ್. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗೂ 1,500

ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮೇಲ್ಪಟ್ಟು ಸಂಬಳವಿರಬಾರದು ಎಂದು, ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಒಂದು ಸಲಹೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಮೇಲೆ! ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಡಿವಿಷನ್ ಕಾರ್ಕ್ ನೋಟ್ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಡದು, ಅಂದರೆ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಗಳೇ ಎಲ್ಲ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನೂ ಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದವರಿಗೆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿನ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಪ್ರಗತಿ, ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಹೇಗಿದೆ, ಸಂಬಳಸಾರಿಗೆ ಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಬರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ನಮೂನೆಗೆ ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಒಂದು ಸಲಹೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಮೇಲೆ! ಏತಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಇದರೂ, ಐ.ಸಿ.ಎಸ್. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು, ಅವರೂ ಐ.ಸಿ.ಎಸ್. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು. ಇವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಮೊತ್ತದ ಸಂಬಳಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳು, ಜೀವಿಗೆ ಬಿದ್ದರೆ ಸರಿ ಎಂದು ಈ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶಿಫಾರಸ್ಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವರದಿಯು ಗಮನಾರ್ಹವಾದುದು, ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಗೌರವಗಳಿಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು, ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಇದನ್ನು implement ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಚಿ. ಮುಯ್ಯಪ್ಪ.—ಅದನ್ನು ಯಾರು ಹೇಳಿದರು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಬಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಾಪ್ಪ.—ನಲವತ್ತು ಪಾಯಿಂಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ಎಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ತಂದುದಿಲ್ಲ? ಅದನ್ನು implement ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದು, ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಸಲಹೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುರಲಿಪ್ಪನವರಿಗೆ ಸಹಭಾಷೆಗಿರಲು ಕೊಟ್ಟು, ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳು ಬರುವವರೆಗೂ ಇರಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆವು. ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಕೊಡಲು ಒಂದು ಪಂಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಮೇಲೆ! ರಿಟೈರ್ಡ್ ದಿವಾನರುಗಳ ಮನಗಳಿಗೆ ಮೂರು ಜನ ಜವಾನರನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ; ಯಾರೋ ಅಂತೆಲ್ಲ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಪಾಂಚ್‌ಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ, ಎಂದು ಏನೇನೋ ಬರದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದೇನು ಹುಡುಗಾಟವೇ! ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ನ್ಯಾಯವಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಈ ರಿಟೈರ್ಡ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ನೂರುಕ್ಕೆ 75 ಜನ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಡಿವಿಷನ್ ಕಾರ್ಕ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ ಅಚ್ಚಂಡ್ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ರೆಪರೇ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಕಾಗದ ಪತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು ಅಂದರೆ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ ಅಥವಾ ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯವರ ಚೀಫ್‌ಮೇಲೆ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಾಗಮಂಗಲ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಒಬ್ಬ ಹಳ್ಳಿಯವನು ಭಕ್ಷಾನ್ನು ತಂದು ಬಿ.ಎ. ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅವನಿಗೆ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಡಿವಿಷನ್ ಕಾರ್ಕ್ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಅವನಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಫೈರ್ ಹೋದರೆ ಅವನು ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ನೋಡಿ work up ಮಾಡಿ ನೋಟ್ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾನೆ. ನಾಳೆಯದಿನ ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಮನುಷ್ಯರ ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೇರ್ಗಡೆ ಹೊಂದಿ ಬಂದರೆ, ಹತ್ತು-ಹತ್ತರದ ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಡಿವಿಷನ್ ಕಾರ್ಕ್ ಆಗಿದ್ದವನನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು, ಇವರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರೊಮೋಷನ್ ತಹಸೀಲ್ದಾರ್ ಹುದ್ದೆ, ಅಥವಾ ಪ್ರೊಮೋಷನ್ ಅನಿಸ್ಪೆಷಲ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ಹುದ್ದೆ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಹಳ್ಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಳೆದಂಥಾ ರೈತನ ಮಗನಿಗೆ ತಹಸೀಲ್ದಾರ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯೋಗ್ಯತೆ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ! ಪ್ರೊಮೋಷನ್ ಅನಿಸ್ಪೆಷಲ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ಆಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯೋಗ್ಯತೆ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ! ಅಥವಾ ಐ.ಎ.ಎಸ್. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ)

ಲ್ಲವೇ? ಪ್ರಮೋಕ್ಷಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಮೆರಿಟ್ ಮತ್ತು intelligence ಗಣನೆಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲವಾದಿದರೆ ಮೆರಿಟ್ ಹೇಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ? ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ನಿವಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ನನ್ನ ಹಾಗೆ ನೀವೂ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿರುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ನಿಮಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ intelligence, ಇದೆ, ಬುದ್ಧಿ ಇದೆ, ಚಾಕಚಕ್ಯತೆ ಇದೆ, scheming nature ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದೀರಿ.....

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I am very sorry. I refute every statement of his.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ನಾನು ನಿಮಗೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ? ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತರಾಗಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಗೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಏಕೆ refute ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ?

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—The Hon'ble Member need not make any personal remarks.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Suppose you (Finance Minister) were in his place or brought under such circumstances; what would you have

done? I do not know why the Hon'ble Minister should be upset.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I am not upset at all.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಗೌರವಾರಾ ವರದಿ ಯಲ್ಲ ಹೇಳಿರ ವಂತೆ ಹಳ್ಳಿಯ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕೆಲಸ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಭರ್ತ್ಯಾ ಡಿವಿಷನ್ ಕಾರ್ಕ್ ಆದ ವನು case work ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ, ಏಕೆ ಎಂದರೆ quick disposal ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—The Hon'ble Member may continue his speech tomorrow.

The House will now rise and meet tomorrow at 3 O' clock.

*The House adjourned at Six of the Clock to meet again at Three of the Clock on Wednesday, the 15th April 1959.*